

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is a brave thing of any one to-day to try to 'rationalize' the Incarnation, to conceive and expound a constructive view of it and of how it came about. This is what the Rev. C. D. HOSTE, M.A., sets out to do in *The Partnership of Nazareth* (Longmans; 6s. net), and any such serious attempt is well worthy of its record in these expository columns. Mr. HOSTE is a serious thinker, and his thoughts are clearly and simply expressed in this book.

He begins by pointing out that, when in the long history of evolution man's life became a self-conscious life, its whole character was changed. For the first time man could think about himself, and in particular could arrange everything round a centre. This is what being a Person means, and the Incarnation is concerned with the personal life of man. But this personal life has not proved an easy thing. The problems and difficulties that are characteristic of personal life make living anything but a smooth business. Many of us ignore these difficulties as much as we can and try to fill our lives with interests that provide a way of escape.

But in the Incarnation Christ came to share the problems of personality and to meet them. And He did this, be it observed, not by the aid of any exceptional power but using only the resources that human nature furnishes. He found a way out of the difficulties that beset human beings with only the help that any of us have. The chief problem of

man is the task of arranging all his experiences round a centre. What has really happened is that man has taken self as a centre round which his life is built up. And this has been the source of all the troubles that have vexed the life of man.

How, on the other hand, did Christ meet and master the difficulties of life? By choosing another centre of His life. He centred His life on God. He made the Spirit of God the Spirit of His life. The story of His ministry is the story of this great personal and spiritual achievement, one so great that we are apt to lose hold of the truth that He was really human through and through, and that He was using only the powers of human heart and thought and will that came to Him at His birth. And this is the secret of *our* similar attainment. At the Cross and Pentecost God bestowed this victorious life on mankind, man's true life, worked out and perfected by the use of human means. And thus we become partners in the working out of the Incarnation.

This is one of the main contentions of the book. The human race has a great part to play in the working out of the Incarnation to its triumphant conclusion. The Incarnation is a seed sown, which mankind is to tend and mature, a seed sown in the heart of the race, to bloom *there*. In the furtherance of this enterprise every human being has something to contribute. It is not a matter of God's action only, or of man's only, but of both, a partnership.

Here is an illustration. A ship is entering a harbour. The pilot believes that it is he that is bringing the vessel into port. The stokers think it is they who are doing it. And both are right. Each of them is doing the whole thing. Neither can do anything without the other. The thing is impossible without the co-operation of each. And it is wholly the pilot that is bringing the ship, and also wholly the stokers! So it is in this great enterprise of the Incarnation. It is wholly God's work, and wholly man's.

---

We come closer to the reality when we scan the inner life of our Lord. It is not in His outward activities that the secret of His life is to be found, but in those hours of loneliness and quiet when the soul could withdraw into itself. Our eyes are too much fixed on the Lord's life of service to others instead of on that inner life that holds the real meaning of His presence among us. And when we look at this, we realize that Christ had not one past but two. He had in Him the past of the race. And we know how much that was disabling lay in that. When He took our nature, He took with it this inheritance from the past. We may recoil from this idea. But if there was an Incarnation at all, it was a real Incarnation. And so we must affirm that Christ's entry into the ranks of the human race means that in the complete sense its past became His past.

---

But Christ had another past, the past of God, a life that was not self-centred like man's. In the life of God there was not anything of self, but altogether and always a giving of self. And what we see in Christ is the choice of this self-giving as the centre of His own life. He did this, as Mr. Hoste always insists, using only the powers and resources of the nature He had made His own. It was this choice that was the secret of His achievement, and His whole inner life was one long loyalty to it. And so when we look at the Incarnation we see it, on the one hand, as a complete break with man's past, and on the other, a complete linking up with God's past. Christ is indebted for His place and influence, His religion for its existence and power, to the fact that, using human nature which seemed so inade-

quate, He did indeed make the Spirit of God to be the Spirit of His life, banishing from it the spirit of self.

---

But there is something more. The Incarnation has two stages. There is first the stage at which we see Christ living under the conditions of human experience, the Son of God using human resources to carry out His enterprise. And there is a second stage, at Pentecost, when the Son of God was again born into the human race, not this time in a stable at Bethlehem, but in what has often proved a ruder shelter, the hearts of men. To share human nature, as He did in the first stage, was to come very near to mankind as a whole and to make Himself dependent on common resources. But to dwell in the hearts of men is to do more, it is to come very near the individual members of the race, and to make Himself dependent on their individual goodwill and service.

---

Thus, and only thus, is rendered possible the lodgment of the Son of God by His Spirit in the personal life of the human race, which in promise and power far exceeds anything that His ministry had known. But the results of this divine venture are dependent obviously on the attitude of men. God has not taken away our freedom, and because the life of mankind is so self-centred, the great enterprise of God lags sadly. For the second stage of the Incarnation waits upon the free service of men and cannot go forward without it. The Incarnation is not finished. The Son of God has put His fortunes in the frail bark of human devotion. This is the way of God.

---

A new volume of the International Library of Christian Knowledge is Principal W. B. SELBIE'S *The Validity of Christian Belief* (Nicholson & Watson; 5s. net). It is claimed that many will regard it as 'the wisest and most vital' of the books which the Principal Emeritus of Mansfield College has written. Be that as it may, it is a mature and welcome contribution to Christian Apologetics from a modern standpoint.



In the Preface Dr. SELBIE says, 'the acid of modernity is not nearly so corrosive as some would like it to be, and the attempt to restate the truths and values of the Christian faith in modern terms is both justifiable and necessary. The older I grow the more clearly do I perceive the danger of identifying Christianity with any of those dogmatic forms in which it found fit expression in the past, and the more convinced am I that theology must learn to talk in language "understanded of the people." It is true that all our language about God and the things of God is, and must be, symbolical. But there are symbols and symbols, and we do well to remember that He whom we call Master and Lord clothed all His teaching in the simplest human terms.'

Religion in its relation to History and Philosophy, Incarnation, Redemption, Faith and Works, Power from on High, Eternal Life, are among the subjects considered; but perhaps the two most topical chapters are those on 'Religion and Psychology' and 'The Divine Initiative.' Let us notice in brief what is said on those subjects.

It is usually considered that psychology is a far more serious threat to religion than any other of the sciences. The reason is that in trying to explain the religious consciousness it often seems to explain it away. No objection should, however, be made to the examination of religion by the method of introspection. But it should be observed that religion can never be fully understood by such method and without any reference to that real and objective 'givenness' (to use a phrase of von Hügel's) which belongs to religious experience.

Man's religious consciousness points him to something or some one above and beyond himself, and assures him of its existence. But for knowledge of the nature of this somewhat he has to look beyond his unaided consciousness to what we call revelation. There is no real distinction between natural and revealed religion. Man finds God in Nature, history, and conscience, because there God is and is speaking. While it is true that man cannot by searching find out God, it is equally true that God is found in the very impulse to search for Him.

Dr. SELBIE adds that in feeling and following that impulse, man's affinity with God is revealed. This is stated in full view of the position of Barth and Brunner, that man is incapable of knowing God, and the whole idea of natural religion illusory. No reflection of God, says the 'dialectic theology,' is to be found either in Nature, or history, or conscience. Religion rests entirely on God's 'givenness.' But such a position, it is here argued, goes a good deal too far, and carried to its logical issue must cut away the ground from revelation. It certainly makes anything like a psychology of religion unnecessary, if not impossible.

If, then, it is in man's very nature to seek after God if haply he may find Him, it must not be forgotten that, according to the witness of the Christian gospel, God on His part seeks after man. Indeed, this truth of the Divine Initiative is a unique feature of Christianity. And the Barthians have done well in calling attention to it once more.

The problem of revelation to-day, continues Dr. SELBIE, is not so much as to its content but as to how to keep open the channels through which it comes. It is needful, in the first place, that in matters of religion men should aim at clarity of thought and absolute sincerity: the search for truth must be fearlessly pursued or He who is the truth will remain for ever hidden from our eyes. Again, there is another channel of revelation in that mystical consciousness of infinity which is especially strong in certain natures. Yet another channel of revelation is in man's moral sense, conscience, or urge to the ideal. The more a man tries to do God's will, not only will his insight into the nature of that will be deeper, but his knowledge of God will be increased. 'It is the saint who is the expert in religion.'

The idea of 'moral rearmament' has completely captured the public mind during the past twelve months. The phrase seems to have been coined, or at least to have been brought into prominence in a speech of Dr. Frank Buchman delivered at



East Ham in May 1938. Following upon that a letter appeared in *The Times* over the signatures of Lord Baldwin and sixteen other eminent people declaring that the critical state of the world could only be met by 'moral and spiritual rearmament.' The subject at once attracted world-wide attention. Quite a flood of letters and manifestoes came from individuals and groups of people in all walks of life, and an international conference to deal with the subject was held at Interlaken in last September.

The phrase 'moral rearmament' is sufficiently vague to make a wide appeal without trenching too closely upon national and religious sensibilities. No doubt it is taken in different senses by different people. Obviously it cannot mean quite the same thing to General Chiang Kai-shek on the one hand and Prince Konoye of Japan on the other, both of whom have blessed the movement.

An interesting and informative article on 'The Meaning of Moral Rearmament' by Professor H. A. HODGES appears in *Theology* for May in which the writer warns against the notion which has appeared in some quarters that the movement simply means an effort to heighten the people's morale or rally the national spirit. This would really be a Totalitarian interpretation, making the State the supreme end. A far deeper and more Christian significance must be given to the phrase if it is to have any real value for the Kingdom of God. It must be taken as a call for individual and corporate Christian thought and action, both self-critical and constructive. 'Christians ought now, before anything else, to take stock of their position and think out afresh the meaning and implications of their creed.'

A few reflections on the subject may be timely. The international crisis which has arisen is known to everybody. Our nation in a mood of reaction after the Great War, and perhaps also in a spirit of hazy optimism, neglected its defences, so that when suddenly confronted by a hostile military power and the prospect of an immediate war, it found itself in a position of the greatest danger. It then became an urgent necessity to recover lost ground and make the nation again strong enough to meet any

emergency which might arise. Such is the situation from the national point of view, and from the Christian point of view it is similar. For a national crisis brings with it a spiritual crisis, and war especially is destructive not only of material things and human lives but of spiritual values also.

What are these spiritual values which are threatened, and what are the moral dangers against which we must now rearm? Let our experiences in the last war supply the answer. In that dark and evil time passions were roused until the claims of Christian love were forgotten or expressly denied. To preach on 'love your enemies' was to invite the charge of being pro-German. There were even leading preachers who declared that the only law applicable to these enemies was the law of the Amalekites. It is customary to-day to lay special blame upon the makers of the Treaty of Versailles, but the fact is that the whole nation and all the allies were keyed up to so high a pitch of hatred and revenge that any more merciful treaty would have been torn to shreds and its makers cast out of office.

There was also a most notorious sacrifice of truth. Anything that would discredit and blacken the enemy or confirm the national morale was legitimate propaganda. Nothing was too dreadful to be invented and believed, until it became next to impossible to attain to the truth. And to crown all, when at last after unparalleled effort and sacrifice, the War was won, and the victory made as complete as force could make it, somehow the long-wished-for fruits of victory did not appear. It was found that there were things which force could not achieve, all the things most essential to human welfare.

Are these lessons all to be lost? If the crisis which confronts us to-day should unhappily come to a head in strife will the same old passions flare up and blind the minds and hearts of the people to the claims of righteousness, truth, and love? These are very serious questions which press for urgent and immediate consideration by the Church and every Christian conscience. It appears from



many evidences in the Press that Church courts are devoting much thought to the part which the Church may be called upon to play in any crisis that may arise, and practical schemes are being worked out so that the various churches may most effectively place at the nation's disposal their resources in men and buildings. Few, perhaps, will be disposed to be critical of this. But one would welcome more evidence that the churches are giving equally definite and special attention to questions of moral and spiritual rearmament.

---

The proper time for rearmament, as every one now knows, is before war begins. The whole life and work of our country to-day has resolved itself into a gigantic struggle to be in readiness if and when a crisis should arise. Otherwise it may be too late, and irreparable loss and damage may result. Are the churches spiritually arming to meet the crisis? Will they sail through the storm of world passions on an even keel? Are the minds and hearts of Christian people being sufficiently enlightened and fortified that they will be able to maintain their faith and not be swept away? These are surely the questions to which, more than to any others, the Christian mind should be most vigorously and prayerfully addressing itself to-day.

---

Take one or two practical points by way of illustration. Are the churches to-day pondering deeply the problems which arise in connexion with the use of force? Is there any common Christian mind on the subject, or in the event of a crisis arising are we to see again the pacifist spirit ranged against the militant with much mutual bitterness and misunderstanding? It may not of course be possible to attain unanimity, but surely every effort should be made in united conference and prayer to attain as large a measure of agreement as possible. Force in itself is a morally neutral thing, and in point of fact is sometimes used by the most extreme Pacifist for purposes of discipline. Its use would then seem to be not so much a principle as a practical problem of degree, in regard to which Christian people if they cannot see eye to eye should be able to differ conscientiously and in charity.

Closely akin to this is the interpretation to be put upon Christ's great law of love, especially in its application to enemies. It is no exaggeration to say that the average Christian when his passions are roused, as in war time, simply ignores this law or vehemently repudiates it. He labours under a double misapprehension. He confuses Christian love with natural liking, and he is apt to feel insulted when, as he imagines, he is bidden like Hitler and his ways. He also fancies that to love your enemy means not to withstand him by force but to let him have his way, and this also he rebels against. If this is anything like a picture of the popular mind there is here great scope and need for very definite teaching on the meaning of the Christian law of love. Theologians have been wont to distinguish between the 'love of complacency' and the 'love of benevolence.' There are some, they said, whose character and ways are pleasing to us, and for them we have a natural liking. But it is a Christian duty to cherish towards all men, even those whom we dislike, a steady spirit of benevolence or goodwill. This distinction can hardly be held to have captured the popular mind. It needs to be explicitly taught and its implications shown. Love may resist, may discipline, may severely punish with a sincere desire of doing good even to the enemy. For as Socrates clearly saw and declared, nothing worse could befall a tyrant than that he should be suffered to go on prospering in his evil way. How extraordinarily hard it would be to maintain the spirit of love under the stress of war only those who have passed through the fiery trial can imagine. All the more reason why every Christian mind should be armed against the time of strain.

---

Another danger involved in the present crisis may be put in Lord Baldwin's words. 'Can the Democracies resist tyranny without becoming themselves enslaved?' And he gave the answer, 'They can only do so if the spiritual effort they put forth is greater than, and in control of, their material effort.' The danger is obvious that in the stress of a world war everything must be subordinated to the supreme interest of national safety. The conditions of modern war make it necessary to control



and regiment the nation to the last degree. Freedom of speech is restricted. Sunday is conscripted and inroads are made upon every department of life. The military mind is naturally autocratic, and resistance is not easy when the nation's life may be at stake. Hence it is no fancied danger that in a world war the people might be drilled and mechanized into an army which, while it emerged

victorious, found that it had lost all that was worth fighting for, its civil and religious liberties. The task of material rearmament which is taxing our statesmanship to the uttermost is surely not so arduous as the task of moral and spiritual rearmament which faces the Church if all that the Christian faith has taught us to count most dear is to be safeguarded and maintained.

---

## The Christian Attitude to non-Christian Religions.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE REVEREND E. G. PARRINDER, MISSION PROTESTANTE DE L'AFRIQUE OCCIDENTALE FRANÇAISE,  
COLLÈGE DE PORTO NOVO, DAHOMEY, FRENCH WEST AFRICA.

WHEN the Jerusalem Conference assembled ten years ago it was with bewilderment and dismay that the representatives of the older Lutheran and Reformed Churches of Europe discovered an attitude of, what seemed to them, compromise and syncretism towards the non-Christian system of religion on the part of the missionaries of Great Britain and, especially, America. They were troubled by the prevalence of a 'very uncertain tone about Christianity itself,' and urged that unless a man has a definite and unwavering Christian message to proclaim 'he simply ought not to go out as a missionary of Christ.' It was with these warnings in mind that the International Missionary Council appointed Dr. Hendrik Kraemer to prepare a statement for the Madras Conference, setting forth the fundamental truths of Christianity, and defining the Christian message to the non-Christian world.<sup>2</sup>

This book has been before the public for nearly a year, and has had excellent notices in the press. It is questionable, however, whether the delegates to Madras have all felt comfortable about the claims of the work to represent the missionary outlook of the whole of Christendom. Dr. Kraemer's aim is, doubtless, to rescue his American and

British brethren from the morass of humanism; but it is possible that his categorical condemnations of all the other world religions will eventually serve to widen the breach that was already discernible ten years ago. His book is scarcely an eirenicon; it is a challenge, but a challenge that may alienate many of those who sympathized with his plea at Jerusalem for the uniqueness of Christianity. We certainly are not content to renounce every specifically Christian doctrine in a desire for empty uniformity with all religious thought of every type. We do believe in the necessity of Christ for every man, and are not satisfied by airy talk about comparative 'values,' and therefore we may consider that Dr. Kraemer's emphasis is, generally, in the right direction. But it is difficult to agree that all other religions are of no value, and their sacred books worthless in comparison with the Old Testament.

It is in his outline of the Christian faith at the beginning of his work that Dr. Kraemer arrives at the position that finally renders impossible any sympathetic approach to the non-Christian faiths. The Bible is the only legitimate source from which to seek an answer to the question, What is the Christian faith? The Bible is radically religious and theocentric, not propounding theories but simply bearing witness to God. It is this intense 'Biblical realism' that challenges man to decide for or against God. In his insistent, almost wearisome, reiteration of the fundamental Biblical realism Kraemer denies that such realism and witness

<sup>1</sup> This is a subject of such importance to-day that a fuller article by Principal W. S. Urquhart, D.D., lately of the Scottish Church College, Calcutta, will appear shortly in the 'Problems of To-day' Series.

<sup>2</sup> *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* (Edinburgh House Press).



to God is to be found anywhere else outside of the Hebrew revelation; though he is obliged to make certain concessions to Islam and later Judaism. All the other religions of the world, however, are summed up and dismissed with the label of 'naturalist religions of trans-empirical realization.' We learn, in a note (p. 143), that this phrase means that all non-Semites try to achieve the identity of their real selves with divine reality; they seek to employ God for their own ends, as 'eros' always does, and are in possession of no authentic revelation. Christianity is antagonistic 'to all human religious aspirations and ends' (p. 123) for they all seek to possess God, rather than to submit themselves to His own free acts.

It follows from these premises that the missionary task is not to seek for the good in other religions, nor to attempt to draw up any 'natural theology' upon which to base the structure of the Gospel. This would be impossible, for the Christian revelation 'transcends and contradicts' all human wisdom, and therefore we cannot talk of a fulfilment in Christ of the truths of non-Christian religions. We must not consider any religion as preparatory to the Gospel, nor draw continuous lines which find their summit in Christ. All we can do is to uncover the 'dialectical condition' of other religions, and of all human strivings after God and the good life. Human religious life apart from Christ, says Dr. Kraemer, is depraved and perverted; and no religion is without its error which is of its very essence.

There is a certain amount of truth underlying these assertions; namely, that the Christian revelation is from above, and is not the product of human striving. It is also true that man's noblest efforts are imperfect, that he cannot obtain by Nature what can only be given by grace. At the same time it is evident that Dr. Kraemer is not always easy in his dogmatic declarations. It might be held that they cover an attempt to avoid the facts of the nobility of some other religions; and though he quotes Karl Barth with approval he also makes reservations. He applauds the Barthian unmasking of relativism, yet realizes that Barth's doctrinal reaction may result in sterile intellectualism. He admits, too, that God does shine, albeit fitfully, in this sinful world. But it is disappointing to find that every time that Kraemer is on the point of recognizing something noble outside the Bible, he takes away with the other hand what he was giving, lest he obscure in any way the uniqueness of 'Biblical realism.' It is uncertain whether Kraemer would accept Barth's dictum that 'religion is un-

belief; it is the work of *godless man*';<sup>1</sup> and he dissents from the assertion that 'there is no point of contact' with non-Christian religions, but he is extremely suspicious of seeking any points of contact because each religion is an indivisible unity, and cannot be discussed in an isolated way apart from the necessary understanding of its fundamental trans-empirical realization.

The whole of Kraemer's theology assumes the doctrine of the 'dialectical' school, and his attitude to other religions seems to rest upon the arguments on General and Special Revelation as set forth in Emil Brunner's *The Mediator*. Brunner discusses the essential revelatory claims of all religions; they invariably depend upon theophanies, oracles, and miracles. But as one of these revelations is final, therefore none of them may properly be termed a revelation; and, as they happened several times, nothing happened at all. They belong to the cycle of Nature, and are mythical; whereas a true historical revelation could only happen once for all. That such revelations belong to the realm of Nature, which is General Revelation, and are subjective forms of the one eternal revelation which is always there and always the same, this was also the conclusion of idealism and mysticism. The error of idealism was in identifying Christianity with all other religions. Brunner rightly insists that Christianity is divine, it is the objective revelation of God, different in quality and kind from any other, and by its very nature it can only take place once, occurring in history, but thereby bringing an end to history, and ushering in the last days.

Both Brunner and Kraemer present us with an exaggerated apologia for the Christian place in the world's religions, and their scheme is vitiated, not because it is entirely unsound, but because it is an over-statement. For some reason they do not wish to admit that there can be any revelation of God outside of Christ. Thus Kraemer will have it that only Christianity is objective, all others being the upward strivings of man, the pride that desires a seat amongst the gods; while Brunner calls other revelations mythical, and should, logically, include the Old Testament therein. Brunner does acknowledge some General Revelation which finds traces of God in all existence and all thought. But, as Professor Farmer has so finely put it,<sup>2</sup> 'to speak of a General Revelation of God in all Nature and

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Dr. Cave, *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, May 1938. Dr. Cave emphatically dissents from Barth's intransigent attitude.

<sup>2</sup> *The World and God*, 81-86.



History is almost a contradiction in terms, for revelation, properly understood, is a category of personal relationship.' Hence it follows that either God does not speak to man at all, or that there is some valid revelation in other religions. 'God may make any situation, into which any man may come at any time, the medium of His revealing word to the soul.'

Non-Christian religions, then, are not entirely subjective, neither are they all erotic seekings after spiritual excitement. As Farmer says, 'the religious man does not feel that he has happened upon God, . . . rather he apprehends God as actively approaching him, as entering, of His own initiative, resistantly and savingly into his personal life.' God does speak to man, to all men, of all races, and in all ages. He does not leave Himself without witness, and, therefore, personal witness; He spoke to our fathers by the prophets. This is just what Kraemer and Brunner will not admit, the objective and divine origin of the revelations of other religions. One may admire their zeal in defending the ark of God, but, in reality, they will be ultimately seen to be doing a grave disservice to the cause of the gospel, for it is no use shutting one's eyes to the good in other faiths. Christian Hindus are not in doubt as to the reality of the experiences of their countrymen. 'Have we saints? So has Hinduism,' says Mr. P. Chenchiah. 'Have we men at peace with God? So have they. Have we men who fight for righteousness? So have they also.' He goes on to say that Hinduism lacks Christ, and needs the creative energy that He gives in the Holy Spirit.

Christ is, indeed, the unique thing about Christianity. We may freely rejoice in the fact that God has spoken to men of all races. We rejoice in the good elements of all the great world religions, for they are of God, and are due to His inspiration. But, in Jesus Christ, God Himself has come into this dark world, once for all, and this coming is directed to the salvation of every fallen soul of man. This is the motive of the Christian missionary message, and the motive is no less strong to-day than it has ever been.

Along with a fearless proclamation of the uniqueness of the gospel there is also a great Christian tradition of sympathetic approach to those who have not had the good fortune to come within the scope of the Christian witness. This tradition began with the apostolic preaching and continued through the Johannine writings, the apologists and Greek fathers, down to scholasticism and the recent centuries. While, regrettably, there have

been interpretations of Christianity that have given away vital elements of the gospel, the fact that such mistakes have been made does not invalidate all effort at interpretation. Indeed, Kraemer recognizes the need for a discussion about 'natural theology' (p. 114 f.), which is still in its first stages, and foresees also that such discussion will bring about a split between the various schools of thought.

The question of natural theology is important because it marks a cleavage between two important schools, the Barthian and the Roman Catholic, as set forth by Aquinas. Brunner (pp. 32-33) condemns the Roman system, because it seeks to lay a foundation in Nature on which the revealed Grace of God may be erected, overarching the whole. 'The good in man is completed by grace, and God and man co-operate in the work of redemption.' This is held by Brunner to be impossible, for 'the relation between general and special revelation can never be complementary,' because Christ is not supplementary but unique. Kraemer continues the good work, acknowledging that reason has a true place, but not defining that place. Aquinas' system was tantamount to denial of the 'existential and dynamic character of Biblical revelation,' because he considered that revelation merely offered additional truths which were not hitherto obtainable by unaided reason. The revelation in Christ is not related to human religious life as a development, but as 'sheer folly,' for 'the opposite of grace is not nature or reason, but sin.'

The intractable attitude towards General Revelation adopted above can be understood, if not accepted, when we remember that it is a fight against that humanism which would equate all religions, denying any direct divine intervention in the world, and thus undermining the whole fabric of Christianity. Nevertheless we still wait for the formulation of a natural theology that shall preserve the faith intact, while yet doing justice to extra-Biblical religions. It is a pity if the whole of Christendom is to be arbitrarily divided into humanists and Calvinists, if there cannot be found a middle way for those who are loyal to the gospel, but wish also to be honest and charitable with regard to others.

The key to the situation may be found in Farmer's statement (p. 83) that 'all religious experience, if it is living and formative, has the quality of revelation in it, has within it the sense that the divine Thou makes Himself known to man in his own personal situation.' Therefore it is misleading to speak of special revelation as if the term only



applied to the experiences of religious geniuses. Religion is not just a species of knowledge, or an attitude to Nature and history; it is a personal relation to a God who speaks. Indeed, the 'discovery' of any truth would not be possible unless God were willing to 'reveal' it. All religion is revelatory, and depends upon this fundamental fact that it belongs to the category of personal relationships. Therefore religion is not simply subjective, but it presupposes the real activity and initiative of God.

It would seem, then, that we need to revise the connotation of our terms, General and Special Revelation, in the light of the personal character of all religion, and of the distinctive traits of Christianity. Under General Revelation may be classed the religious manifestations observable outside the Christian dispensation. These are not merely subjective and human efforts to build a Tower of Babel, and become divine. On the contrary, we are obliged, in all fairness, to acknowledge the genuineness of God's speaking to them. If we deny this it would appear that we are afraid to face facts, and such timidity will eventually defeat itself, for truth will out. There is a danger, too, lest we fall into a sort of Deism; can we believe that God has never spoken to men outside of Israel, and that He has withdrawn Himself from those who have earnestly sought Him, as the saints of other religions certainly have done? Or are we to see the divine prompting in the very search for light, and accept the witness of these men that God verily has spoken to them.

At many times, then, and in divers manners God

has spoken unto our fathers, and this we will call General Revelation. The initiative is with God, He reveals Himself. But in Jesus Christ we have a Revelation that not only surpasses all others, but that is without parallel; different in quality and kind. The eternal Word, that lighted every man coming into the world, came Himself into the world as a man, 'the Word became flesh.' Here the Johannine witness to the Light that had always been in the world culminates in the wonder of the Incarnation. This, indeed, we may call the Special Revelation; the One, Unique Miracle, occurring 'once for all.' We may join hands with Brunner in all his fervent affirmations of the majesty and uniqueness of our Lord and God.

Such a re-definition of the terms General and Special Revelation would satisfy us on both the points raised in this paper. We should do justice to the true and revealed elements in the non-Christian religions; their highest developments point supernaturally (not 'naturally,' as Kraemer would have it) to Christ, for these very developments are of God, and are His preparing work for the coming of the Christ. We should also hold fast to all the essence of our faith, and all the intensity of our missionary zeal. For we have a faith to declare to the world. Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, came to earth once for all for our salvation. He died for us, and rose again having defeated the powers of sin and death. This gospel, of which we are witnesses by faith, is of urgent and vital import to every human soul, and it is laid upon us to obey our Lord's command and 'make disciples of all nations.'





## Problems of To-day.

### IX. The Spiritual Capacity of the Plain Man.

BY THE VERY REVEREND S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., DEAN OF EXETER.

It may of course be only a coincidence, but it does happen that St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians contains one of the great slogans of what might be called Christian Democracy. The appropriateness of the slogan in such a context is this: the Colossians had become infected with a rather complicated sort of misbelief. With the theology of it we are not now concerned, but its intellectual method seems to have been aristocratic and exclusive. '*We are the enlightened; we know; we are entitled to despise, or anyhow to dismiss, the common, uninitiated herd.*' It sounds nasty, but all Gnosticism—and the Colossian heresy seems certainly to be a variety of that—invariably makes this arrogant claim. The suggestion is that God does not will that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, but only the committee, that is, '*we.*' Against the heresy you have in the Epistle a clear exposition of the Christian doctrine about Christ. Against the exclusiveness you have, in the course of the theological argument, this simple statement of his purpose—to proclaim Christ, '*admonishing every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ.*'

That was indeed what the Master had always said. It is even more vital to remember that it followed from what the Master had done. His mission had included—almost it had been—the rediscovery of the person whom Mr. Walter Page once called '*The Forgotten Man,*' not to speak of the Forgotten Woman, and the even more Forgotten Child. Our Lord's '*Inasmuch*' picture of the Great Assize had shown that the hungry and the prisoners were within His universal constituency. His Cross had established once for all the unprecedented and regenerating fact that the Most High God had sought and found man at the level where he actually was, in the dust and shame of sin. This was indeed to enfranchise everybody. This was world-suffrage. And St. Paul, himself an intellectual, himself a man of at least the middle classes, and apparently possessing what are called '*private means,*' knew that the gospel meant freedom for the disinherited. In 1 Co 1<sup>26ff.</sup> he is eager to remind his Corinthian converts that they did not number many distinguished persons in their ranks. They were a foolish,

weak, ignoble, insignificant crew. From what he says later, e.g. 6<sup>9-11</sup>, it would seem that some of them at all events had been drawn from the dregs of the population of what was admittedly an ill-famed city. In 2 Corinthians he even exults in certain weaknesses that were discernible in his own equipment, his lack of rhetorical ornament, his unimpressive presence, because it shows that the power behind what had been done must surely be of God.

What about to-day? Those of us whose duty or whose choice it is from time to time to formulate statements about Christianity—that is, the preachers and Christian writers—are always declaring that religion is intended for the plain man. There is sincerity and often eloquence in the declaration. There is abundant evidence for its truth. It has everything, except an audience. It lacks nothing, except credence. The plain man does not receive the declaration. At least not in the sense in which it is intended. There are many notable exceptions, as every pastor knows, but, broadly speaking, the plain man does not pray with us, he does not listen to our sermons, still less does he communicate with us. He has one or more copies of the Bible in his home, but he never reads it, and he knows almost nothing of its contents. The utmost that can be said of his regard for organized religion is that on the whole he has no objection to it, and indeed wishes it well. I know, of course, that many hundreds of Christian people to whom I have ministered, and millions more elsewhere, would, if they ever saw these words, indignantly deny them. They would say, '*We are plain people, and we are faithful and happy members of the Christian Church.*' They are indeed, and the Church is blest in their faithful and happy membership. But I am not thinking of them. I am thinking of their neighbours. I am thinking of the households where Sunday is thought of only as a day of extra sleep, extra food, an outing, and the company of friends. There is no harm in any of these things, but people who habitually live in a world of *x* dimensions become first of all forgetters, and then deniers, of the existence of *x plus*.

And yet there is a paradoxical survival. I can remember hearing Dr. Armitage Robinson many



years ago in a Cambridge sermon quote from a French Abbé, whose name I have forgotten, this splendid sentence, 'The battle is lost, but there is time to win another.' I expect that the Abbé was thinking of the invincible spiritual resources that are contained in the Body of Christ and are available in the gospel. That is indeed the grand asset, and that is why we can never be defeatists. A hopeless Christian is a contradiction. St. Paul, speaking of our Lord's Resurrection, habitually uses the perfect tense, 'Christ hath been raised.' The perfect tense, say the grammarians, expresses the abiding result of completed action in the past. Further, you have only to put together two Johannine sentences, 'Be of good cheer: I have overcome the world' and 'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith,' to see that what we call the battle is only part of a war which is moving towards an assured conclusion. 'The action of the Risen Christ,' said Lord Acton, 'upon the world which He has redeemed fails not but increases.'

All this is the armoury of faith. But there is another asset. The character of the plain man is wonderfully Christian. It is not necessary to draw any contrasts between Britons and others. We are not concerned to deny or even to minimize the prevalence of such character elsewhere. But it is natural for us to think of what we know. And it is certain that among our fellow-countrymen the effect of diffused Christianity has been very great indeed. A part of the message of the gospel has been overheard by those who did not know that they were listening in. The ethics of the gospel, or some of them, are practised by many who are quite unconscious of the source of their inspiration. The fellowship of the gospel has planted itself far beyond its own visible limits. Something even of the faith of the gospel has passed, anonymous and unrecognized, into the spiritual fibre of millions who know nothing of either Abraham or Paul.

What is the evidence for this? The evidence is known to any Christian who tries with any success to get on terms with those who do not profess the allegiance which means so much to him. This is done in clubs, pubs, railway carriages, Trades Councils, Chambers of Commerce, in panel-doctors' waiting-rooms, in ordinary social life. And it is really done by innumerable Christians. I myself, one among many, often travel by train. I am handicapped by a natural taciturnity, and a queer uniform. I often have work that I should like to do. Yet whenever I have overcome the initial feeling that the people in the carriage probably do

not want to talk to me, I have always been encouraged by the result. I hasten to add that I am referring only to the life of the third-class carriage. The rules of the first-class carriage are not known to me, but I have been given to understand that they are quite different. I suppose that the writers of fiction always travel in their own motor-cars, or have reserved compartments on the train. For they, always faithful to a venerable prejudice, represent Christians as persons with a very narrow definition of goodness and of very uncharitable character. They have never heard of Cowper's verse:

For thou, within no walls confin'd,  
Inhabitest the humble mind;  
Such ever bring thee, where they come,  
And going, take thee to their home.

Or if they have, they dismiss it and the facts together as contrary to their sacred prepossessions. There is, it must be admitted, one occasional exception to their verdict. Their literary Calvinism does allow a few to be saved. Every now and then a charitable minister of religion is introduced into their pages. But he does not help us much. He is quite incredible, because in order to become charitable he has performed the impossible feat of becoming 'wholly emancipated from dogma,' which is rather like saying that he has wisely laid aside the backbone and the arms and legs with which a few of his obscurantist contemporaries still foolishly choose to be encumbered.

In point of fact the Christians of to-day are extraordinarily ready to see merit, goodness, virtue, the raw material of Christianity, in persons outside their own circle. They do this without wavering in their own conviction that personal faith in Christ is a necessity and that regular prayer and worship are the things that keep it alive. This is real toleration. The toleration of the genial toper who says, 'I'm broad-minded; I don't care what a man believes so long as he acts up to it,' is friendly and good-natured, but it is superficial. It would not stand much strain. The toleration of the Christians to whom personal faith is vital, a thing more prizable than life itself, who nevertheless can welcome whatever is to be welcomed, can give credit wherever it is due, is a far finer, more magnificently balanced thing. And this is what the Christians do. They know that the real metaphor for the Church is not the box, not even the Ark. It is the fire. It has consuming qualities. But it also has the quality of warming anybody who is within reach of it.

'Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him



declare I unto you.' The people to whom that was said are described in the Authorized Version as 'Very superstitious,' in the Revised Version as 'Somewhat superstitious,' in the margin of the Revised Version, which is here, as almost always, to be preferred, as 'Somewhat religious.' It is of course quite incredible that St. Paul's *deisidaimonesterōi* was intended to be anything except a compliment. And this in spite of the fact that the Unknown God at Athens was in all probability not the Supreme Deity who is behind all these manifestations, that is, the kind of conception that an Aeschylus would have intended by such a term, but only a name unwritten on a dotted line. The anonymous altar was a spare part, intended to deceive and satisfy any god for whom, by some oversight, among the multitude, no special provision had been made.

When it is said that the task of Christians to-day is to declare to all and sundry, Athenians, Spartans, Boeotians, and 'barbarians' alike, the Unknown God, the words are meant in the high sense which St. Paul, whether innocently or deliberately, gave to them. What he would have made of them in the end we do not know. He was not allowed to finish. What we have is only his *ad captandum*

opening. When the Athenians had licked off the jam and came to the powder they interrupted him.

It is always difficult to carry hearers from the one to the other. We can all remember the young man's sermon on, say, Abraham, which ends, 'And so we see, my brethren, that we must be more regular in our attendance at the House of God,' or some other edifying but non-sequential moral. Yet the attempt must be made. And seeing that the connexion does already exist in the will of God, it cannot be an impossible task to unveil it. The existing connexion is that God has made man, has set him in domestic and other larger communities, has given to him Christ. Among the basic faculties of human nature are the capacity to see the world against a background of one pervading, all-including Reality, a capacity to trust an Admired Person, a capacity to find in itself ideals which seem to have come not from below but from above, and a capacity of membership. What are these but the raw material of belief in God, belief in Christ, belief in the Holy Spirit, belief in the Church? The man who says, 'I expect those Germans are very decent fellows in themselves; I have never wanted to go to war with them'; the woman who will sit up all night with a sick neighbour, are not far from the Kingdom.

---

## Literature.

### DR. MATTHEWS ON THE TEACHING OF CHRIST.

MESSRS. BLACKIE & SON have projected a series of books which promises to be interesting. The general title is 'What Did They Teach?', 'they' being the great figures in world history whose influence on life and thought has been pre-eminent. The authors are to essay an almost impossible task, 'to state, without criticism or advocacy, and in their own words as far as possible, the teaching' of the great men chosen. Certainly the Very Rev. Dr. W. R. Matthews, who opens the series with a volume on *Christ* (5s. net), makes no attempt at this anemic performance. In this book he is perfectly fair in his estimate of the value of evidence, as he always is. But he writes as a Christian believer, and we presume he was chosen on that account.

After a chapter on the sources and another on Jesus as Teacher, Dr. Matthews discusses in succession the teaching on the Fatherhood of God and the Kingdom of God. Not everybody will agree with the author that the Kingdom of God was the main theme of our Lord's teaching. It is possible to hold that it was more or less an inherited form in which the teaching was cast, but that the substantial truth which dominated all Christ's thought and life was the Fatherhood. The Parable of the Prodigal Son, and not the Parables of the Kingdom, was the core of His deepest life. But Dr. Matthew's treatment of the doctrine of the Fatherhood is satisfying in itself.

When the writer proceeds to deal with 'The Life of the Sons of the Kingdom,' he is faced with the exacting demands of the Sermon on the Mount, the other cheek, the coat and the cloak, and the extra mile. He points out that literal obedience to these



precepts would abolish society of any kind. Not only are Christ's words hard to obey, they are impossible. 'They condemn any society which has existed or would exist,' because the evil man is not to be resisted at all. 'The use of force, whether through police or other means, to restrain the anti-social individual is even more clearly prohibited than war by the words of Jesus.' Professor Whitehead, commenting on the Sermon on the Mount suggests, that the apocalyptic setting of Jesus' thought enabled Him to disregard consequences, to abstract His mind from the probable results of acting on the principles He laid down, and thus to have 'absolute ethical intuitions.' Dr. Matthews' own explanation is not very different from this. Jesus was setting up a standard by which progress must be measured and exhibiting a vision of a life that might be. The only society which could satisfy Jesus would be one in which the Sermon on the Mount would be the norm of human living.

In the two chapters which deal with the Forgiveness of Sins and the Atonement we find Dr. Matthews at his best. He expresses his decided view that Jesus accepted the title 'Son of Man' in its apocalyptic sense for Himself, but He also saw Himself in the picture of the Suffering Servant, and it was in the combination of these two conceptions, not merely as ideas which had never been brought together before but as actual realities in His own experience, that He looked at His redeeming work. To fulfil the high destiny of the Son of Man He must endure the experience of the Suffering Servant.

Two chapters close this suggestive volume, one on Jesus and the Church, the other on Jesus and Human Society. Dr. Matthews doubts the authenticity of the two passages in St. Matthew where the 'Church' is mentioned. The only one that matters is the saying of Jesus 'on this rock will I build my church.' The reasons Dr. Matthews gives for his scepticism on this point will seem unconvincing to many who are not particularly hide-bound. There is no reason why Jesus should not have used the word 'ecclesia' which was in common employment, and the sedulous training of His disciples shows that He had a body of people in view to carry on His cause. It was, however, in Dr. Matthews' view, the belief in the resurrection of the Son of Man which created the Church.

The question of the relation of our Lord's teaching to political and economic issues is discussed in a good chapter in which Dr. Matthews details the probable reasons why Jesus made no reference to such matters. Not only the nature of His own

purpose and mission determined Him or the probability of a speedy end of the 'age,' but largely the fact that the popular conception of the Messiah's functions would misread any intervention of Jesus in the social problems of the time.

This book of Dr. Matthews is a satisfying rather than a brilliant contribution. It is clear, comprehensive, and well-balanced. Some of the chapters are slight, but the space was limited, and Dr. Matthews has made good use of what was at his disposal. We are always thankful for any book by this distinguished author, and he has added to our debt by this latest one.

---

JOHN WESLEY.

Yet another life of Wesley! But a good biography with a place of its own among many works of the kind! The author is Bishop Francis J. McConnell, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Church in the United States of America—*John Wesley* (Abingdon Press; \$3.00). The special interest of the book is the more detached American standpoint from which Bishop McConnell approaches his subject, an attitude which enables him to criticise as well as praise his hero. The work is described on the wrapper as 'a book distinguished both by its lucid style and by the common sense of its interpretations,' and the description is fully justified.

Bishop McConnell has clearly made a careful and detailed study of the relevant literature. He discusses with much insight the early influences which played on the life of Wesley, giving, in particular, a much more balanced estimate of the character and worth of Samuel Wesley, Senior, than is common among biographers. He thinks that we should be 'chary of accepting Wesley's own interpretation of his adolescent days,' and gives a discriminating account of the influence of Oxford upon his mental development. Of the visit to Georgia he says: 'The difficulty was that in Georgia he was the knightly Don Quixote, without the good hard sense, coarse good sense, if you wish, of any Sancho Panza.'

Step by step Bishop McConnell carries us through the well-known story of Wesley's life, giving special emphasis to the Aldersgate Street experience on 24th May, 1738, and to the decision to undertake open-air preaching at Bristol on 4th April, 1739. Sections follow on Wesley as pastor, as organizer, and as defender of the faith. There is an evident reference to Cell's recent treatment of Wesley's theology when he reminds us that, to his statement



that Methodism is but a hair's-breadth from Calvinism, Wesley added 'and from antinomianism.' 'Those who thus use the quotation,' says the Bishop, 'should quote also the antinomianism reference.' Perhaps it is a little difficult for an American Methodist to do justice to the Catholic strain in the theology of the Wesleys. More important elements in the book are Bishop McConnell's account of the ordinations of Coke and Asbury, his criticism of Methodist teaching on Christian Perfection, his shrewd comments on the recent imaginative studies of G. Elsie Harrison and Marjorie Bowen, and, above all, his full discussion of Wesley's contribution to social righteousness. The book has its faults. Careful students will miss detailed references to the many authorities cited, and there are too many repetitions. Three times, for example, we are told of John Pawson's destruction as 'useless baggage' of Wesley's notes on Shakespeare's plays. None the less this is a valuable work which no student of Wesley and the Evangelical Revival in the eighteenth century in England can afford to miss. It is no small achievement to present Wesley in his shortcomings as well as in his greatness, and yet to leave upon the mind of the reader the picture of a man who was, and is, one of the greatest of God's gifts to the social and religious life of England and America.

#### BROWNING AND MODERN THOUGHT.

The study of a poet by a poet must always have a unique and special interest. That is enough to make one approach Miss Dallas Kenmare's book, *Browning and Modern Thought* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net), with a special interest. If it were for nothing else, Miss Kenmare's book would be well worth reading for the extraordinary gift of concise and vivid phrase that she herself possesses. One cannot resist quoting a few of her notable sentences marked in the passing. 'The world is an admirable forcing-house for false theories.' 'Success is apt to be accepted thoughtlessly, but it is impossible not to reflect on the meaning of failure.' 'Despair is no practical solution to a problem.' 'The human mind is provided with an almost limitless number of defences against unwelcome truth; day by day it unconsciously erects barriers.' 'Purity, no less than lust, can be a passion.' 'The pure in heart not only see God; they see human beings as God's children, not as creatures sharply divided into opposite sexes.' A book which contains such incisive and memorable writing is in any event worth reading.

Miss Kenmare is no blind worshipper of Browning. She is able, in spite of her admiration for him, to see the faults that undoubtedly do exist in his writing. She is willing to admit that, 'He was a supreme realist; his writing was often ugly and it was unquestionably often obscure.' On these counts he ranks with the moderns. She is able to speak of his 'one æsthetic failing, his peculiar, fantastic, and often exasperating rhyming-devices.' She declares that the poem, 'A Woman's Last Word,' 'is almost an error in taste; here the poet seems to trespass. The ground is too intimate, or his manner of approach a trifle indiscreet.' In so speaking she shows herself an honest and open-eyed critic and not merely a sentimental admirer of the poet's works.

Her volume, as well as an Introduction and Conclusion, contains four main sections in which she treats of Browning as 'The Poet of Humanity,' 'The Poet of Love,' 'The Poet of Art and Nature,' and 'The Poet of Christianity.' In the section, 'The Poet of Humanity,' she deals with that recurring problem of Browning criticism, the fact that he, almost alone of all the great poets, had no struggle and suffering and tribulation to bear, which his soul might afterwards turn into song. She finds that Browning's particular struggle was an inward struggle, that eternal struggle somehow or other to make the real fit the ideal in an imperfect world. Earlier in the book she declares that 'it is the task of the poet to observe and to record the significant,' and when she comes to speak of Browning as 'The Poet of Art and Nature' she well shows how the all-embracing interest of the man in every branch of art and life made him see significances in everything. In writing of him as 'The Poet of Love' she quotes with approval Chesterton's phrase which speaks of Browning as holding the 'doctrine of the great hour,' and illustrates widely and wisely how he used it. In the section 'The Poet of Christianity' she concludes with some words of Browning himself taken from the dedication to 'Sordello': '... the development of a soul: little else is worth study. I, at least, always thought so—you, with many known and unknown to me, think so—others may one day.' And in truth it is that study of souls which makes Browning so great and so valuable a poet.

The book is well produced with a very useful Index. It might have been better, if, when other authorities were being quoted, not only the name of the book, but the page of the quotation had been given in the footnotes, and it would have been



better if the reference to Bible quotations had been always, and not only sometimes, given.

The book as a whole is not merely an easy way of getting to know Browning; it is that far better thing, a book which will send those who did not know him to find him out, and those who have half-forgotten him to rediscover him. Miss Kenmare more than hints that she wrote this book as an attempt to discharge a debt for what Browning's writings had done for her personally, and she may rest content that it is a fit tribute to her benefactor.

### FAITH AND REASON.

The French philosopher, M. Etienne Gilson, has published his Richards Lectures in the University of Virginia under the title—*Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages* (Scribner's; 6s. net). The volume consists of three chapters on the subjects of 'The Primacy of Faith,' 'The Primacy of Reason,' and 'The Harmony of Reason and Revelation.' In these chapters Professor Gilson would test the truth value of the common statement that in the Middle Ages the normal use of natural reason was obscured by blind faith in the absolute truth of Christian Revelation.

He finds that two great 'spiritual families' of philosophy dominate the era of Faith. The first, which may be traced back to Tertullian, is made up of those theologians for whom Revelation had been given to men as a substitute for all other knowledge, including science, ethics, and metaphysics. The second, which may be traced back to St. Augustine, is made up of those theologians for whom the safest way to reach truth is not to start from reason and then go on from rational certitude to faith, but to start from faith and then go on from Revelation to Reason.

The ideal of a purely philosophical wisdom was upheld in the era of Reason by Averroes. For Averroes, the absolute truth was not to be found in any sort of Revelation, but in the writings of Aristotle, whom he never tired of commenting on and annotating. He was, however, of opinion that some sort of agreement between religious faith and philosophical reason might be reached. Difficult to maintain in a Muslim civilization, the position of Averroes was a strictly impossible one for his Latin disciples. Still less than the Koran could the Bible and its theological interpretations be regarded as nothing more than popular approaches to pure philosophy. To provide relief for their difficulties the Latin Averroists sometimes looked upon philosophy as the knowledge of what man

would hold as true, if absolute truth had not been given him by the divine Revelation.

Thomas Aquinas endeavoured to achieve a complete harmony of philosophy and theology. He distinguished two main classes of knowledge. In the first class is a certain number of revealed truths which, though they be revealed, are nevertheless attainable by reason alone. Such are, for instance, the existence of God and His essential attributes, and the existence of the soul and its immortality. The second class contains all the articles of faith properly said, that is to say, all that part of the Revelation which surpasses the whole range of human reason. Such are, for instance, the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption. If reason cannot prove them to be true, neither can it prove them to be false.

Says Professor Gilson: 'A man who does not like to believe what he can know, and who never pretends to know what can be but believed, and yet a man whose faith and knowledge grow into an organic unity because they both spring from the same divine source, such is, if not the portrait, at least a sketch of the typical member of the Thomist family.'

M. Etienne Gilson is a distinguished member of that family, and so is M. Jacques Maritain, and in these days, when Faith sometimes pours scorn on Reason, when a Tertullian-like theologism would in certain quarters drive philosophy out of court, these writers are both worth listening to, by Protestants as well as by Roman Catholics.

### THE RECOVERY OF THE ANCIENT HEBREW LANGUAGE.

Professor D. Winton Thomas, who recently succeeded Dr. S. A. Cook in the Regius Chair of Hebrew at Cambridge, has published his inaugural lecture under the title—*The Recovery of the Ancient Hebrew Language* (Cambridge University Press; 2s. net). He very modestly disclaims any intention of offering an original contribution to the study of the language (which he could well have given), and confines himself to indicating the main lines along which recent research has proceeded. It is not generally realized how much progress has been made, and how much evidence is available for the discovery of a stage in the development of the grammar which differs from that presented by the printed text of the Bible. The work of Bauer and Leander and of Professor G. R. Driver (whom Professor Thomas tends to follow rather closely) has introduced to us several

important new theories, and to these should be added the evidence supplied by Greek versions and transliterations, especially studied by Sperber. It is claimed, for instance, that Hebrew is a mixed language, containing elements belonging to the three great groups, Akkadian, Aramæan, and southern. The tense system is a simplification of an earlier and more elaborate type, which included at least four forms. Fresh facts have come to light, especially in Akkadian and Ugaritian, while facts long familiar can now be viewed from a new angle. The resultant theories are extremely interesting, but it must be confessed that some of them still need close scrutiny, and it is worth noting that Professor Thomas is more cautious and guarded than his predecessors. When it is said, for instance, that Hebrew is a mixed language, are we to understand that it was originally a form, shall we say, of Akkadian, which borrowed elements in grammar and vocabulary from other groups, much as English has borrowed from and through French? It has long been recognized that it was the speech of pre-Israelite Palestine, modified to some extent by the Aramæan invaders, but can we go farther back than this? To many philologists it will seem that the facts may equally well be explained on the hypothesis that Hebrew has preserved elements belonging to the primitive Semitic stock which have otherwise survived only in one other language or group. Some peculiarities of Hebrew are universally attested, for example, the substitution of a long O for an original pure-long A, which appears not only in Greek transliterations but even in the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible. The theory of tenses, too, so brilliantly propounded by Professor Driver, does not correspond with the little we know of general human tendencies in the evolution of verbal forms, and to many it will still appear more probable that the two commoner Akkadian forms were differentiated from one another only after the separation of the eastern Semites from the main stock. But considerations of this kind must not blind us to the immensely wide learning which lies behind Professor Thomas's little monograph, to the accuracy of his facts, or to the clarity of his statement. We may hope that he will restate his position at greater length, for his combination of knowledge and balanced judgment cannot fail to carry the greatest weight.

### ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

The Archbishop of York has found time to write the first volume of a commentary on the Fourth

Gospel which he modestly entitles *Readings in St. John's Gospel* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net). The book is 'not a systematic commentary or exposition; nor is it intended for scholars or theologians—though whatever value it has for souls on pilgrimage may be as real for them as for others. . . . But it is an attempt to share with any who may read it what I find to be my own thoughts as I read the profoundest of all writings.' In a brief but sufficiently full introduction the writer deals with the authorship and historical reliability, making a strong plea for the consistency of the Johannine and Synoptic pictures of Jesus. The commentary itself covers the first twelve chapters of the Gospel which, excluding the Prologue, are divided into two Acts, first 'the Lord introduced to various types of men,' and second, 'the Lord in controversy.' The text generally followed is that of Westcott, and a fresh and very suggestive translation of it is given. The whole is a work of ripe scholarship and profound Christian thinking which appeals equally to the head and the heart. It is to be hoped that the second volume will soon appear, for there can be little doubt that the commentary will take a permanent place among the most valuable contributions to the elucidation of the Fourth Gospel.

### ISRAEL'S MISSION.

There are two ways in which knowledge progresses. The easier, though more spectacular, is the discovery of facts hitherto unknown, the harder is the arrangement and reinterpretation of data which are familiar but imperfectly understood. A good illustration of the latter is to be found in Professor H. H. Rowley's new book, *Israel's Mission to the World* (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). Dr. Rowley is the ablest of our younger Old Testament scholars, and brings to his task a wide range of knowledge, an experience which includes a period of missionary service in China, a passion for accuracy in details, and a sympathetic insight into the meaning of literature. This rare combination of qualities has enabled him to produce an extraordinarily fine piece of work. Originally delivered as a series of lectures to the Vacation Term for Biblical Study, the four chapters into which the book is divided give us the best discussion of the subject which we have yet had. Dr. Rowley traces the world-wide message of Israel at least as far back as the Exile, and shows how it persisted down to the Christian era in spite of the tendency to concentrate on the glory of Israel rather than on the salvation of



mankind. The second chapter—'Particularism and Proselytism'—is devoted to the conflict between these main ideas, tracing it through the Persian and Greek periods. Incidentally, there is a new and attractive interpretation of the Book of Ruth. As far as Judaism itself was concerned, the particularist forces proved the stronger, but in the Christian Church the spirit and message of Israel germinated and broke through the shell which had served to protect the living kernel through a period of supreme danger. The final chapter is devoted to the positive and lasting contribution of Israel to man's spiritual life. Here Dr. Rowley feels that he can make only a selection from the stores of material available, and lays stress on the ethical element, the 'recognition of history and experience as the vehicle of revelation' (we are reminded of Wheeler Robinson's remark that 'history might be called the sacrament of the religion of Israel'), the insistence on a pure monotheism, the idea of spiritual worship, and the Bible itself. The author treats every part with an originality which does not disdain the work of his predecessors, and the whole is a well-balanced presentation of the case. Dr. Rowley writes in a deeply devotional spirit; none but a man inspired by the idea of a universal faith could so completely have appreciated and expressed the breadth of a gospel which offers salvation to all mankind. Though the book is comparatively short, it is one of the greatest contributions made in recent years to the literature of religion.

A very interesting contribution to the literature about Abraham Lincoln is contained in *The Growth of Lincoln's Faith*, by Dr. Harlan Hoyt Horner (Abingdon Press; \$1.50). The author describes how Lincoln progressed from a somewhat general and vague religious attitude to, in the end, a much more definite and evangelical faith. The first may be illustrated by his saying, 'When any church will inscribe over its altars, as its sole qualification for membership, the Saviour's condensed statement of the substance of both law and gospel, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God and thy neighbour as thyself," that church will I join with all my heart and soul.' The second is exhibited in Lincoln's *cri de cœur*: 'I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seemed insufficient for that day.' There does not seem to have been any real question of his substantial orthodoxy at any time, but as life went

on the great verities became more real to him and took a vital place in his experience. Dr. Horner's book, while keeping Lincoln's spiritual progress chiefly in view, provides us with a pretty full biography of the man as well. It is a most interesting study.

The study of the New Testament is more than holding its own in the religious world. We have had a number of really good books on the subject in this country lately, as a glance at the columns of this magazine will show. But the subject has a perennial life and interest, and perhaps in America they have not yet had enough. At any rate, the latest essay comes from the other side—*The Study of the New Testament*, by Professor Clarence Tucker Craig (Abingdon Press; \$1.00). It is brief, and in a sense elementary, but decidedly intelligent. It is intended for adult and young people's classes in the Church school and for the guidance of ministers in providing material for their teaching work. The results of critical research are freely used, with a leaning to the left, but the final attitude is constructive and evangelical. Each section of the New Testament is examined in turn, its contents described, its data and authorship fixed, and chapters of a more general nature provided, such as 'The Faith of Paul.' We should say that, apart from a slight tendency to regard as certain what is at least problematical, this book will give to inexperienced readers sound guidance on what the New Testament is and how it came into being.

The art of essay writing in the style of Lamb and Hazlitt seems to have almost disappeared, though we have occasional examples of it from time to time, and few literary efforts can be more welcome when the thing is well done. Dr. Lynn Harold Hough has been practising this art with success in America, and the various series of his 'Forest Essays' possess a charm which comes partly from their literary style and partly from the easy way in which the author discusses fundamental problems. The third series has just been published under the title, *Free Men* (Abingdon Press; \$2.00), and it possesses all the attractive qualities of previous volumes. Dr. Hough discusses such topics as Loneliness, The Immanence of God, The Price of Christian Literacy, and The Well-made Man. The most interesting essay is probably that which gives the book its title, a discussion of free-will, which is not too profound but by no means superficial. The book is one that will give a great deal of pleasure and not a little serious instruction and inspiration.

The widespread interest to-day in the religions of the world has produced *The World's Religions: A Short History*, by Mr. Charles S. Braden, Ph.D. (Cokesbury Press, Nashville; \$1.50). A few years ago a similar, single-volume, account was produced in Great Britain by E. E. Kellett. For Dr. Braden's history the publisher claims that it is 'brief but comprehensive, popularly written but scholarly, and not apologetic but historical.' These aims have been in considerable measure achieved, though the brevity of treatment almost necessarily leads to inadequate summaries of aspects of the religions that cannot be presented in a sentence. Thus the account of the Brahman-Atman doctrine in the Upanishads fails to make clear the significance of the conclusion, 'Thou are that.' To say, 'This would get one off the wheel' is to make the great climax almost ridiculous.

It is, indeed, impossible to compress the dreams and speculations of mankind into a single volume of two hundred and fifty pages, and at the same time make them intelligible and suggest their moving character. What can be done Dr. Braden has done with much skill. Among the few errors that occur are the statement that the Todas belong to the north of India instead of the south, an account of the treatment of outcasts in South India which applies only to a part of that area, and the inevitable misspelling of Mr. Gandhi's name. It is, no doubt, the difficulty of compression that explains the misleading statement that Muslims 'believe in the Christian sacred book.'

Americans have invented a new name for a more or less new functionary. He is a Counselor (with one 'l'). His function lies between that of the educator and that of the consulting psychologist. His patient is too abnormal for simple education, and not abnormal enough for the psychotherapist. Counselling is less a profession than a technique, an art that may be employed by the doctor, the teacher, the pastor, or the social worker. The counsellor aims at giving mental health by advice based on special knowledge. He tries to set free the riches of the personality by removing restraints. This is the idea behind *The Art of Counseling*, by Mr. Rollo May (Cokesbury Press; \$2.00). The writer has had a wide experience of counselling himself and illustrates his points by numerous 'cases' that have passed through his own hands. Wisely he does not employ the specialized psychotherapeutic techniques which cannot be used by the lay counsellor. His main weapons are a trained observation of people, common sense, and a keen

power of analysis. He has learned from every school of psychology, from Freud, Jung, Adler, and others, and utilizes the truth in their 'systems,' but is a slave to none. Religious and social workers of all kinds will find real help and guidance in this wise book.

Mr. Bernard Lord Manning, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, is a sound, if somewhat extreme, self-critic. He says of his book, *Why Not Abandon the Church?* (Independent Press; 2s. 6d. net), 'As I have read the proofs, I have shuddered. . . . The book is as scrappy, unbalanced, undignified, and ungrammatical as the talks were.' We suspect, however, that the author really enjoyed the explosive and downright style of his argument, and at any rate the reader will. He lays it on with a will across the poor non-churchgoer, and indeed there is nothing left of this individual at the end but mincemeat. Underneath all this ruthlessness, however, there is a serious and convincing argument for church attendance. But that is not the only plea of the book. It contains in two of its four talks an apologia for Congregationalism, which will be appreciated by members of that body and which will be read with interest and profit by members of other bodies.

The veteran missionary Professor S. M. Zwemer, having retired from his Chair in Princeton, has made good use of his leisure by writing for the Inter-Varsity Fellowship *Dynamic Christianity and the World To-day* (Inter-Varsity Fellowship; 2s. 6d.). The book is in two parts. The former gives an account of the gospel, stressing its absoluteness against the relativity of much modern religion and emphasizing the centrality of the Cross and the necessity of preaching it, though to the natural mind it is the supreme stumbling block. In the second part of the book a brief survey is given of the religious situation in the world of to-day. As might be expected from one who spent forty years in Muslim countries special attention is given to the power and decline of Islam. The survey on the whole is encouraging, and the writer concludes with a strong plea for itinerant evangelism so that the gospel may be carried along all the untrodden ways of every land.

The Jewish Publication Society of America is continuing its series of Commentaries on the Pentateuch, and a third volume, dealing with the Book of Numbers—*The Holy Scriptures: Numbers with Commentary* (\$2.50) has now appeared. The



writer, Dr. Julius H. Greenstone, has produced a fine piece of work. His standpoint is that of an orthodox Jew, but he is familiar with the best modern work on the Pentateuch, and makes full use of it. The comments are given in the usual style, with a short introduction for each passage and notes (sometimes fairly extensive) on words and phrases occurring in the separate verses. These are judicious and illuminating, facing the difficulties which the reader feels, and offering the best solution available from the author's point of view. There is constant reference to the Jewish traditions, as is to be expected, and we have thus presented to us a type of exegesis which commonly receives far less attention than it deserves. The book is a very useful contribution to our knowledge of the Pentateuch.

We have already reviewed *The Faith that Lives*, a volume of popular lectures by the Rev. Francis Davidson, B.D., D.D., and *The Devotional Literature of Scotland*, by the Very Rev. Adam Philip, D.D., and are now glad to welcome them in a popular edition published by the Lassodie Press at 2s. 6d. net.

A commentary on the Psalter is probably the hardest task which an Old Testament student can undertake, and we have to admit with regret and some shame that we have no adequate book on the subject in English. It is not surprising, then, to feel that Father Lattey's volume on the first book of the Psalms (Pss 1-41) in the 'Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures'—*The Old Testament: The First Book of Psalms* (Longmans; 5s. 6d. net)—does not impress the reader as strongly as did his commentaries on Ruth and on some of the Minor Prophets. It belongs to the type best represented in English by the 'Century Bible,' with an introduction to each Psalm, in which a good deal of space is devoted to the metrical structure, and short notes on individual verses. The method hardly leaves room for the best type of exegesis, the application of the message given through the experience of these ancient saints and poets to the spiritual needs of to-day. Father Lattey, too, has not availed himself to any great extent of the progress made by the newer school represented by Gunkel, Mowinckel, and Hans Schmidt. He is aware of their work, and uses it judiciously for purposes of textual criticism, but neither adopts nor expressly rejects their general point of view. In this he may be justified, for he is not writing for experts, and the more recent method of approach

is still *sub judice*. His metrical analysis, too, is at times open to criticism, though here again he may fairly claim that no general consensus has been reached. The best part of his work is the translation, which is based on a text cautiously and judiciously emended, and we may feel that, if the conditions of the series had made it possible, he might have produced a more satisfying study of the Psalms with which he deals.

In the 'Needs of To-day' series of books (a series admirably planned and already enriched by volumes of real value), the latest is *Training in Prayer*, by five writers, under the editorship of Mr. Lindsay Dewar (Rich & Cowan; 3s. 6d. net). The main ideas in the book are, first, that knowledge of the way of prayer is one of the greatest blessings we can possess; second, that there is a technique to be learned of teaching this way of prayer to others; and third, that for such instruction we must have both spiritual discernment and spiritual knowledge. The writers, accordingly, set themselves very modestly to give such guidance as is needed for teaching various ages of children the art of praying, and also for training the congregation in worship. There is a chapter on 'More advanced Teaching on Prayer.' The book is a helpful one. Its spirit is both reverent and practical, and the writers are well aware of the dangers that await any one who deals with such a subject. He may be too technical or, on the contrary, too elementary; too High Church or too Low Church; too mystical or too practical. These dangers are avoided. 'Advanced' matter is concentrated in one chapter, and the book as a whole is on a level that will appeal to the plain man and woman. The first three chapters are on 'Training little Children to Pray,' 'Training Boys and Girls in Prayer and Worship,' and 'The Training of Adolescents in Prayer and Worship.'

The serious and thoughtful reader might be prejudiced against a book bearing such a title as *What Use is Religion?* He might without further consideration relegate it to, at the best, the class of cheap popular apologetic. But the book before us (published by Scribner's Sons at 7s. 6d. net), while popular in style, is far from being cheap and superficial. The author, the Rev. Elmore McNeill McKee, who is Rector of St. George's Church in the city of New York, is well equipped for the exposition of Christian doctrine, especially in answer to questions that trouble many minds to-day. While his book is not written for the

scholar, it gives in many places statements of the findings of modern scholarship such as are suitable 'for the thoughtful man in the street.' Among the subjects discussed are God, the Soul and Immortality; Sin and Salvation; Prayer; the Bible and the Church. The standpoint might be described as modern and conservative. The preacher will find here a great variety of fresh illustrative material.

'There are many good books about preaching, others about reading, and a few about studying. But there does not appear to be one book which includes all these three, and so the writer was impelled to write this present book.' So Mr. Robert H. Jack, M.A., B.Sc., writes in the Preface to *Pulpit, Lectern, and Study: A Layman's Guide to Preaching and Reading* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d. net). It would be nearly impossible to over-praise this book. It is packed with wisdom of the most practical and the most necessary kind. The author discusses the making and preaching of sermons, addresses to children, reading the lessons, and the duty of careful study. There is hardly any aspect of pulpit work that is not handled with just the kind of advice that is most needed. Mr. Jack has lay preachers in view, but much (if not all) that he says is as much needed by the clergyman as by the layman. How to read, how to use illustrations, how to speak ('speak out but don't shout'), whether to read sermons or to 'preach' them, how to manage the voice, how to use quotations, and so on—there is no end to the topics of definite importance that are discussed. A list of books on the same topics is added at the close.

*Faith of Our Fathers*, by Miss Florence Higham, M.A., Ph.D. (S.C.M.; 5s. net), is a most readable book which gives some account of 'the men and movements of the seventeenth century.' The names of the leaders of all the religious parties are here, from Hooker, Andrewes, and Laud to Baxter, Bunyan, and Fox. The writer succeeds in giving a vivid portrait of each, and discourses on all of them with insight and sympathy. The names of others less well known are woven into the narrative which thereby throws many interesting side-lights on the troubled period of the Commonwealth and the Restoration. We note as a somewhat glaring inaccuracy that the Westminster Assembly is spoken of as 'an assembly of Scottish Divines.' In point of fact there were only four Scottish divines in an assembly of a hundred and fifty. But in general the whole narrative is marked by

accuracy and fairness. In a final summing up, the writer does not regret that the policy of 'flattening out the differences by legislation' failed, but sees for the future 'another alternative to the unhappy cleavage into sects, that of a Federation of Churches working in harmony while retaining each its special character, keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.'

We have received the second set of the 'Crisis Booklets' which are being published by the S.C.M. Press at a shilling.

The Rev. Canon F. A. Cockin's booklet, *What Does 'A' Do Next?*, aims at giving a practical answer to that most urgent question. He calls for more sustained and serious thought on the crisis and on human affairs generally. Then he calls for action and suggests concrete ways of helping refugees and others in desperate need. Finally, he is convinced that the present troubles are the result of the activity of spiritual forces of evil which cannot be cast out without united and earnest prayer.

In *A Church Militant* the Rev. Leslie S. Hunter deals earnestly with the shortcomings of the Church, and while acknowledging that the Church does much already he urges that more should be done in relating the Christian faith to the common life and in giving to that common life a Christian stamp through the renewal of public worship and the teaching of a dogma and ethic which are clear, relevant, and cogent.

*The Commonwealth of Man*, by Miss Ruth Rouse, is the least critical of the series and not the least helpful, for the Church, like the individual, will not do its best if it is always being nagged at. The writer of this booklet not only believes that the commonwealth of man is an attainable ideal but brings impressive evidence to show that in Christ the national and racial barriers which divide men are in great measure overcome. It is heartsome to read of these things and to see in them some tokens that the Christian Church is not so effete as many believe.

The latest volumes in the 'Religion and Life Books' are *How to Use the Bible*, by the Rev. John W. Coutts, D.D., and *The Christian Answer to the Problem of Evil*, by the Rev. J. S. Whale, D.D. These are published at the price of 1s. net each by the Student Christian Movement Press.

The death of Professor Machen in 1937 at a comparatively early age was a severe loss to the Christian world in general and to the cause of



reformed theology in particular. One of his former students, the Rev. William Masselink, Th.D., gives some account of him in *Professor J. Gresham Machen* (Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids; \$1.00). The book contains a brief biographical sketch with a much fuller discussion of the Modernist movement which Machen opposed and of his methods of apologetics. For a sketch of this sort the writing is too polemical, and the lines too harshly drawn, so that the whole becomes a series of disjointed argumentations. The format of the book, which appears to have been printed in Germany, is not pleasing with its pages abounding in bold capitals and quotation marks turned the wrong way. The proof-reading also has been somewhat carelessly done. We feel that with all the writer's enthusiasm for the subject of the sketch he has failed to do justice to a great Christian scholar and thinker.

*The Galilean Gleam*, by the Rev. R. W. Yourd, B.D. (Zondervan Publishing House; \$1.50), purports to be 'a history of the Christian Church,' but it is not to be taken as serious history. It consists of a number of short chapters with catchy titles which deal with critical episodes in Christian history. It is written in a disjointed style with little regard for accuracy. Taking the chapter entitled 'In Greyfriar's [sic] Churchyard' we are

told that the Scotch [sic] drew up there 'the first of the Solemn Leagues and Covenants,' that 'Mary of Scotland went to France to plot with her mother,' that John Knox 'went up to Holyrood Castle,' that 'Rome offered to make him a bishop if he would retract.' These are a few samples of the glaring inaccuracies which disfigure the pages. The writer is evidently an enthusiast for the Reformation, but his work is so disjointed and unilluminating that Protestants can only say, *non tali auxilio*.

Many books have been written on the work of the Holy Spirit, but the subject is inexhaustible and of perennial interest. Every Christian out of his own experience and study of the Bible should have some distinctive witness to give. Such a witness is *The Bible Revelation of the Holy Spirit*, by the Rev. John B. Kenyon (Zondervan Publishing House; \$1.00). The writer proves himself to be a careful and sane student of the Scriptures, and he writes in a very plain and helpful way. His book is confessedly doctrinal, but it is expressly written for the lay reader and is fitted above all things to give practical guidance for the Christian life. Its teaching is made vivid by a number of apt illustrations and the chapters should prove suggestive for a series of sermons on the person and work of the Holy Spirit.

## Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

MUCH light has been thrown on the art of the Hebrew monarchy by the recent finds (1931-35) of early ivories, amounting to several hundreds, on the site of ancient Samaria. Some of them are blackened by fire, but many are as white as when they were carved. According to the style of the carving and the character of the script found on many of them, they date from the ninth century—somewhat earlier than the Samaria ostraca—and probably come from Ahab's famous 'house of ivory' (1 K 22<sup>39</sup>), where they were doubtless used to decorate the wall panelling, the couches, beds, and other furniture, and perhaps even small caskets and articles of toilet. Mr. J. W. Crowfoot, who has now made a minute and careful examination

of them, states that they resemble 'very closely' the collections from Nimrud and Arslan Tash, which date from about the same period, and that they look indeed as if they came from the same workshop. The subjects depicted on them are very diversified, comprising Egyptian gods, sphinxes, winged figures, lions, processions of animals, fabulous creatures with the head of a bird or a ram, human beings with wings, and various other representations. The sphinxes are pictured as mighty superhuman beings, with animal bodies, reminding us of Yahweh's riding upon the cherubim (Ps 18<sup>10</sup>, 2 S 22<sup>11</sup>). Some of the lions are represented as crouching and open-mouthed as if roaring, and these probably decorated the arms of the throne

or the steps up to it, if we may judge from Solomon's ivory throne which had 'arms on each side of the seat, flanked by two lions, while twelve lions stood on each side of the six steps' (1 K 10<sup>19, 20</sup>, Moffatt's version). Indeed, many figures similar to the Samaria ones seem to have covered the doors and walls of Solomon's temple. A number of the ivories have decorative borders consisting of 'sacred' or 'palmette' trees, and in some cases the 'palmettes' alternate with sphinxes or winged figures, the latter form of ornamentation being one that occurs in Ezekiel's temple ('It was made with cherubim and palm trees; and a palm tree was between cherub and cherub,' Ezk 41<sup>18</sup>). A popular subject is the 'Woman at the Window,' which probably represents Ashtart, and which seems to have been repeated at intervals on the panels and furniture. One ivory has two rows of hieroglyphs, which, according to Mr Alan Rowe, give the proper name Eliashib ('God is Restorer'), borne presumably by some priest or chieftain in Samaria. The occurrence of the name at this early date disproves the view held by some scholars that it was not in use in pre-exilic times.

The art on these ivories was really Egyptian though it came through skilled artificers in Phœnicia. The Samaria ivories, indeed, mark the rise of a new wave of Egyptian influence in Palestine, which started with the beginning of the twenty-second dynasty (c. 947 B.C.) under Sheshonk I. (the Biblical Shishak), and which seems to have spent itself before the middle of the next century. It runs, as Mr. Crowfoot says, 'from the more or less legendary days of Solomon to the end of the reign of Ahab.' It is another proof that, under the rule of Shishak, there was a real revival of Egyptian power in Palestine, far beyond what the Biblical record implies. It is interesting to note, by the way, that a gold-covered sarcophagus containing this Pharaoh's jewelled mummy was discovered by Professor Montet a few weeks ago at Tanis (*San el-Hagar*, in the Nile Delta), in a tomb that belonged to his royal predecessor, Pasebkhanu (c. 976-947 B.C.), whose daughter married King Solomon, and whose sarcophagus has not yet been found. The treasure in the tomb is stated to be second only to that found in Tutankhamun's.

About twelve years ago, Professor Kurt Sethe published some Egyptian texts which were written on potsherds in the hieratic script, and which had been found in a Theban tomb. They belonged to the end of the eleventh dynasty (c. 2000 B.C.), and contained a list of certain districts, cities (including Jerusalem), and peoples in Palestine at this early

date. A number of additional texts, inscribed on earthenware figurines or statuettes which have long lain forgotten in the Museums of Brussels and Cairo, and which date from the twelfth dynasty (c. 2000-1788 B.C.), have now been examined and translated by G. Posener. The figures represent various types of prisoners or foreign adversaries bound and ready to be slain, and were considered by their owners to possess magical powers. The texts, like Sethe's, have been found to contain lists of names, some of them Palestinian, and occurring in the Old Testament. In Sethe's texts twenty Syro-Palestinian countries are referred to, together with the kings of fourteen, but in these new inscriptions we have more than fifty mentioned, with their ruling princes. They include Amurru, Jerusalem, Shechem (*Skmimi*), Aphek, Migdal, Hasor (*Hasuri* of the el-Amarna Letters), Bethshemesh, Simeon (*Smu'nu*), and others. The mention of these names, especially that of Simeon, at such an early date is interesting. The term 'Aperu' (*Pru*), which according to many scholars is the Egyptian for 'Hebrew,' forms an element in five of the proper names. Hitherto the earliest mention of the 'Aperu' has been in a folk-story about the siege of Joppa under Thutmose III. (c. 1501-1447 B.C.), but if the name, as seems probable, corresponds to the Babylonian 'Habiru' and the Biblical 'Ibhri,' we have here an Egyptian reference to the Hebrews not long after the time of Abraham. As all the texts have not yet been deciphered, further discoveries may be expected. It is clear that in these early ages the Foreign Office of the Pharaoh had an excellent knowledge of the political geography of Canaan and kept itself in constant touch with developments there. All this supposes a system of well-organized diplomatic relations five or six hundred years before the el-Amarna period.

The seals in general use by the Israelites for attesting documents or safeguarding valuable objects were of the stamp or signet kind (cf. Gn 38<sup>18</sup>). Indeed, by the seventh century B.C. most countries had adopted this simple style. But in earlier times, as far back even as the third millennium, cylinder seals were predominant, especially in the Mesopotamian regions. Small and valuable objects were packed in jars, and a piece of cloth or animal skin was then stretched across the opening and bound with string round the neck. On this fastening some moist clay was laid, and the cylinder seal was then rolled over this. It was thus impossible to tamper with the contents of the jar without breaking the seal. Large packages or bales of goods enclosed in mats were secured in



the same way. According to Dr. H. Frankfort, who has made a special study of these cylinders, they contain innumerable designs—gods and goddesses, human beings, animals, geometric patterns, hunting scenes, fighting groups, ritual ceremonies, and others, while many of them have also a short inscription on them. Some of the designs or inscriptions throw an excellent light on certain Old Testament texts. The priest, for example, is sometimes pictured as holding a bucket of holy water and a sprinkling brush, and standing on a square stool or podium. The wide occurrence of this representation suggests that it was on such a stool, and not near a pillar, that king Josiah stood 'to make his covenant before the Lord' (cf. 2 K 23<sup>3</sup>, R.V., Margin). Perhaps, in the magico-religious ideas of the times, the stool was used to put the worshipper 'on a level' with the god, and the mounting of it by the priest may have been the final act of a 'rite de passage' by which he left the impurity of his earthly environment and became able to approach the deity.

Among the animals which appear in the scenes of combat on the Assyrian seals we find lions, bulls, horses (with or without wings), all kinds of dragons, and the innocent ostrich, which also occurs in a hunting scene. This bird thus stands on an equal footing with the beasts and monsters just enumerated, reminding us of a passage in Deutero-Isaiah which speaks of 'the beasts of the field, the dragons, and the ostriches' (Is 43<sup>20</sup>. A.V. has 'owls,' but 'ostriches' is the translation generally accepted by Semitic scholars). On some Assyrian seals the god (probably Assur) appears within a winged disk (so made as to represent clouds), and seems to be bestowing his protection on the king and people below. We have the same conception depicted on the 'Broken Obelisk' in the British Museum, dating from the eleventh century B.C., where the main feature is a pair of wings, so closely feathered as to represent clouds, and two hands project from these, one apparently blessing the king beneath, and the other holding a bow. Such cylinders illustrate the Old Testament idea of Yahweh dwelling in a cloud. As guide of the Israelites in the desert, He covered Himself with a cloud; at the time that He descended on Mount Sinai, a cloud overshadowed it; and in Old Testament poetry, He rides on the clouds (cf. Ps 18, and the Ras Shamra Tablets). Thus, as pointed out by Gunkel, the idea of Yahweh's throne in heaven above may be traced to the clouds as the dwelling-place of the Deity. Some of the Akkadian seals, however, depict the god sitting on his throne in a

room with waters above, below, and around. Such pictures appear to represent Ea, the god of the deep, who at an early epoch succeeded in vanquishing the primeval waters (*Apsu*), and who according to the *Epic of Creation* thereupon founded his secret chambers on them. Such a picture affords an explanation of the well-known text (Ps 104<sup>3</sup>), 'He layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters.'

In spite of the lamented death of Mr. J. L. Starkey, who was director of the Wellcome-Marston excavations at *Tell Duweir* (ancient Lachish), the work at this important site has continued under the care of Mr. C. H. Inge. Further information is now available in regard to the temple, which is believed to have been founded about 1550 B.C., judging from a polychrome vase unearthed from its lowest level. It seems to have been rebuilt at the beginning of the reign of Amenophis III. (c. 1419 B.C.), and again probably during the reign of Seti I. (c. 1322-1301), and it is known to have been still in existence in the time of Ramesses II. (1301-1234), nearly three hundred and fifty years after its foundation. Three important facts regarding it are worthy of note. *First*, its site lies at the foot of the tell, outside the walls of the city. This may have been due to the development of an important suburb along the main road at this point. At the same time it should be remembered that in every age it was not unusual to erect sanctuaries and holy places beyond the city enclosures. Outside Jerusalem, for instance, there was one at the Gihon Spring (to-day the 'Virgin's Fountain'), another beside En-Rogel, the Fuller's Spring (now known as 'Job's Well'), and one on the summit of the Mount of Olives (2 S 15<sup>32</sup>). At Petra there were important places of sacrifice on the hills around. Perhaps the reason why no sanctuaries have been discovered on the outskirts of Palestinian cities is because excavations have been confined almost entirely to the tells themselves. *Second*, another peculiarity of the Lachish temple is that no traces have been found in it of animal sacrifices, but only of cereal and perfume offerings. This seems remarkable if the Hebrews were in possession of the city after the Conquest or even if the Egyptians had control of the worship, for in both these cults the sacrificing of sacred animals was a most important ceremony. As an institution it is as old as the human race itself (cf. Gn 4<sup>4</sup>), and arose as an expression of man's dire need of God. It may be possible, of course, that sacrifices took place at Lachish in some adjoining court not yet located or in some sanctuary within the city, but

on such a matter one can only await further light. *Third*, the excavators have been struck with the large number of toilet and jewellery objects discovered in the later temple. While these may be a sign of piety, of a special generous nature, on the part of the female worshippers, they may indicate that the later temple was not exclusively dedicated to a male deity, but to some goddess, perhaps Elath (later supplanted by Ashtart, the Biblical Ashtoreth), whose name occurs in a vase inscription found on the site. It is known that there was a widespread popular belief in the special powers of this female divinity, for whom Solomon erected a shrine which was later destroyed by Josiah.

One of the most interesting discoveries by Mr. Inge has been that of a potter's workshop situated in a large cavern and dating from about 1200 B.C. Many potters' tools and materials have been found, including lumps of red and yellow ochre, pebbles and cockle-shells for burnishing, a stone seat for the potter, and two stone pivots for his wheels. The finished wares were stored in a smaller cave at the side, accessible by a spiral flight of steps, and no doubt it was here that many visitors to the temple purchased their offering bowls and plaques of the goddess Ashtart. It is the first time that a potter's equipment has been discovered in Palestine, and it gives us an interesting insight into the craft as carried on there in early Israelite times, long before the first mention of pottery in the Bible (2 S 17<sup>28</sup>, בִּלְיֹצֶר, 'potter's vessel'). There can be no better memorial to the late Mr. Starkey than a continuation of these excavations at Lachish, so generously provided for by Sir Charles Marston.

Further evidence of the widespread trade communications between Palestine and the rest of the world in ancient times is afforded by Sir Flinders Petrie's resumed work at *Tell-el-Ajjul* (ancient Gaza). More objects of Irish gold and Irish workmanship have been discovered, consisting of ear-rings of the spiral style, brilliant in appearance and with carefully hackled edges. Large hoards of gold ornaments from the far north have also come to light. Some of these are almost identical with some found in a silver jar at Maikop, one hundred and thirty miles east of the Sea of Azov, at the extreme end of the Caucasus. Most of the finds were tied up in cloths or parcels, and comprise stone pendants (eight-pointed), ear-rings, rosettes, toggle-pins, and various other ornaments. Along with these there were four parcels of silver objects, doubled up (as some of the gold ones were) ready for melting. It is evident, as Petrie thinks, that Gaza was a chief centre or port of exchange, especially between the northern regions (including the Crimea) and Arabia as far south probably as Hadhramaut. It was a central emporium, receiving gold ornaments even from Ireland, and exchanging these for such things as spices, aromatics, and other goods not too bulky to be carried back. This seems corroborated by the fact that only weights averaging about half an ounce have been found at the site. It is possible that pedlars travelled regularly down from the north and other parts, buying up old ornaments, and receiving trade material at Gaza in return for them. Strabo informs us that 'there was such an abundance of aromatics in Arabia that cinnamon, cassia, and other spices were used by the natives instead of sticks and firewood.'

## In the Study.

### Virginibus Puerisque.

#### Hidden Things Made Plain.

BY THE REVEREND DUNCAN FRASER, M.A.,  
INVERGORDON

'The Lord . . . will bring to light the hidden things.'—1 Co 4<sup>5</sup>.

One day—a few weeks ago now—when I opened my morning paper I found two very interesting paragraphs. Each was interesting in itself, but

the strange thing was that they should both have appeared in the same paper on the same day, for one dealt with the biggest things we know, the stars and planets, while the other had to do with the tiniest things in the world, the minute germs and microbes that cause disease.

The first was an article about the world's largest telescope which is at present being assembled in the United States. The lens for this new and very wonderful telescope, it is interesting to know, is to



be made by a London firm. When it is finished it will be almost as big as the front of a small house. The giant steel 'horseshoe,' or frame, in which the telescope will be swung has just been completed in Pittsburg, the famous steel city. To get the extraordinary precision necessary in such a huge 'horseshoe' it had to be installed in a polishing mill and rotated past the grinding tools for six months during which more than two tons of steel surface was ground away. When the telescope is completed it will be set up on Mount Pilmoar, California, and astronomers expect that it will bring a thousand million stars within reach of the human eye. It will be powerful enough, they assure us, to enable a watcher to see the light of a candle several thousand miles away; and the moon, 240,000 miles distant, will in effect be brought to within 50 miles. It is also expected that it will solve the question whether the 'canals' on Mars are anything other than disfigurements caused by natural processes.

The second paragraph was, I think, still more interesting. It had to do with the world's 'super-microscope.' Apparently up to now scientists have been unable to make a microscope that can magnify more than 2000 times because the nature of light makes optical magnification beyond that impossible. But this latest 'super-microscope,' the invention of two German engineers, works on a new principle and can magnify up to 30,000 times—fifteen times more than the old instruments. It will help research workers in the examination of ores and metals and many other things, and it will also be of very great assistance to doctors when they try to discover those tiny germs which do so much damage and cause so much pain when they get into the cells and tissues of the human body. The pity is that these new microscopes are so elaborate that for the present only fourteen are to be manufactured, and all of them, it is reported, are to be kept in Germany. One hopes that later on the Germans will allow the whole world to share in their wonderful new invention.

These two modern marvels, the giant telescope with its power to reveal the mysteries of this great Universe and to bring the far-off things near, and the super-microscope that can unfold the wonders of the tiniest things, carry our minds back to the Lord Jesus Christ. He has done something even more wonderful than anything the giant telescope can do. When He came into the world He helped to bring God and the great things of life near to men. Before He came men worshipped God, and through the long ages they learned more and more about Him. But it was not until Jesus came to live among

men, and to teach them, that God was brought really near. 'He that hath seen me,' He said, 'hath seen the Father,' which just means that everything about Him was a revelation of God. He showed them God's *will*, helping them to discover the things God wished them to do, and the kind of men and women He would have them be. He showed them God's *love*—how wonderful a thing it is, far greater and more enduring than any human love. He showed them God's *forgiveness*—how ready He is to forgive, and to go on forgiving as long as we are truly sorry for our faults.

But Jesus has also done more than the super-microscope can do. He turned His light in upon the hearts of men, and revealed all the dark little corners where the tiny but very, very deadly germs are always lurking. It was said of Him that 'He knew all men, and required no evidence from any one about human nature; well did He know what was in human nature.' He knew all about the little hidden sins and faults, and He let men see them in their true light—the ungenerous thoughts, the selfish motives, the unworthy ambitions. No one else has ever been able to lay bare as Jesus did, the secrets of men's hearts. But He did more than lay bare the unworthy things—He also showed the good things in their true light; the things which Wordsworth called

that best portion of a good man's life,  
His little, nameless, unremembered, acts  
Of kindness and of love.

#### Think and Thank.

BY THE REVEREND E. INGHAM, M.A., LIVERPOOL.

'I thank my God upon every remembrance of you.'  
—Ph 1<sup>8</sup>.

In the early days of the Christian Church a great Christian teacher lay in a dungeon in Nero's Rome. While there his mind wandered back to the days when he was free and was able to teach in the churches. One of the churches he had visited was in a city called Philippi, and in that church there were some people whom this teacher loved very much. And well he might, for when he visited them they had been very kind and ready to receive his message. Even while he was in prison they remembered him and sent money to him with which to buy food. It is to be expected, then, that when he wrote to them he would say something like the words of our text, 'I thank my God upon every remembrance of you.' In other words, he said to them, 'Every time I think about you, I am very thankful to God for you.'

It is a great thing, and a right thing, to think about people who have done a good deal for us and to thank God for them.

I wonder if any of you young folks have ever been to Cambridge! Many of you know that it is a great university centre, and there are many wonderful and beautiful things to be seen there. Among them there is an old church known as Great Saint Mary's, and I should think that almost every student who has passed through Cambridge has entered that church at one time or another.

Not very long ago I paid a visit to Cambridge to revive old memories and re-experience the thrills of student days. I entered Great Saint Mary's church and reverently knelt in one of the pews. There were several hassocks in the pew and I noticed that on the hassocks were three words—**THINK AND THANK.** Don't you know it was a great idea on the part of some one to have those words on the hassocks? The teacher who was in a dungeon in Rome was Paul, and he thanked God every time he thought about those good people in Philippi. The people who attend Great Saint Mary's are bidden amongst other things, to think about all the good things that God, through His Church, has done for man, and then to thank Him for His goodness.

There are also some very fine stained-glass windows in that famous church, and the story that some of those windows tell is about the good and useful men of days gone by who went out into the world to preach the love of our Saviour. Those windows bid the worshippers remember 'the glorious company of the apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, and the noble army of martyrs.' In many of our churches a very old hymn called the *Te Deum* is often sung. In that hymn we remember all these benefactors, and we thank God for them.

We sometimes think that apostles, prophets, and martyrs lived in the days long gone by. But we must remember that we have them to-day also. We have them in our own church. The apostles are those people who have close fellowship with Jesus; who walk and talk with Him, and who seek to bless and inspire people as He did. Your Sunday-school teachers and all who seek to be like the Master by following in His steps are apostles.

There are prophets in our day also, not merely in the centuries before Jesus came to earth. The prophets are those people who live so intimately with God that He reveals to them some of the secrets and wishes of His heart. They are the people who can see much further than the rest of

their fellows, and God uses them to expose evil things and unjust practices among nations and in kings and rulers, and to point the way to better laws, better treatment of our fellows, and a nobler worship of God.

Then there is that company known as the martyrs. These are they, from among the apostles and prophets, who have been cruelly treated and oftentimes killed because they have been faithful to the new vision which God has given them; a vision of a world from which injustice and oppression and sin are banished. There have been thousands of them, and we have them to-day. There are still many men and women who are suffering and in prison because they love God rather than the powers of this world.

When people enter Great Saint Mary's in Cambridge, and kneel to pray, those stained-glass windows remind them that they should think about the servants of God and be thankful for them. In that very church some of the martyrs themselves have worshipped and preached. Latimer, who was burned at the stake in the time of Queen Mary, often worshipped in that holy place, and now, after nearly four hundred years, people are reminded by the windows and the hassocks to remember him and thank God for such as he.

Children, do you ever thank God for all the splendid people of the past and of the present who have made this country of ours a better and safer place for us to live in? Do you ever think of Jesus who was the Leader of all true apostles, the noblest of the fellowship of the prophets, and who, in a greater sense than any martyr, gave His life that we might live? As you think of Him, He will become to you a hero, strong and tender, and you will be moved to thankfulness for God's gift of His Son, Jesus Christ.

### *The Christian Year.*

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

**Love the Result of Forgiveness.**

'When they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both.'—Lk 7<sup>42</sup>.

Parable and incident hold so closely together that neither can be rightly read apart from the other, and it is only when readers forget the parable that they blunder into the astounding mistake of supposing that the woman's sins were forgiven on account of her love. Such a reading 'strikes the parable a blow in the face,' for nothing could be plainer than the declaration of Jesus that love



was and always is the consequence and not the occasion of forgiveness. Jesus' explanation of the scene is contained in these words, all occurring in v.<sup>48</sup>—'they had nothing to pay, he freely forgave, which of them will love him most?' These give the whole story.

1. 'They had nothing to pay.' This reckless girl had awakened somehow to the sense that she was at the end of her resource. Year after year she had laughed away any thought of to-morrow or of the life she was living, but time ran on and the claims mounted, and now when the debt was due she realized that she had nothing with which to meet it. Jesus used a more sinister word than the vague 'creditor' of our Version, He talked of a moneylender, the familiar tyrant of the improvident. By shifts and promises and renewals his day may be postponed, but he will not always be played with, and when he acts it is with effect. The age of Jesus knew nothing of an easy bankruptcy and discharge: in another parable we read of a debtor thrown into prison and submitted to torture until he paid the debt in full. The use of such a word as moneylender in this connexion is one of the audacities of Jesus; but, like His servant Paul, He recognized that in the background of our human life there is an element of the inexorable. 'God is not mocked,' says Paul, and this gay girl had now drifted under that appalling shadow.

It is not what Burns calls 'the quantum of the sin' which counts in such a situation, it is the sense with which the fault is regarded. Jesus here suggests that, whether a man's fault in actual amount seem great or little, yet when he comes face to face with God he is left without excuse. These two debtors were conscious that all the legalities were against them, and that nothing could be gained by pleading or by promising: the blunt fact was that they were beaten, and they knew it. And that, says Jesus, is where this woman woke to find herself; life turned upon her a face as grim and un pitying as any usurer, and thus she was thrown back on her impotence and her despair. But then, to her amazement, a door opened and she passed through, leaving these behind. She found herself in a new-washed earth, where cleanness was expected of her and where the powers of life were full. Her debt had been forgiven, she herself was saved with so great a salvation, and this had come unsought, un hoped for. Do you wonder, asks Jesus, that she is moved? It is in the first amazement of pardon that she is here, and if she is beside herself it is to God. Was there ever an interpreter like Him of

this queer human heart, where lovely things are intertwined with things base and hateful?

2. 'He frankly forgave them both': in this Jesus declares God's mind towards all such beaten creatures. Preachers often enlarge upon the naturalness of the parables, but much might be said also of their occasional and deliberate unnaturalness, for Jesus was so impressed with the fact that God's ways are higher than ours that He often found the human standards not to apply. In this parable far the most interesting and individual figure is that of the moneylender, who also is an eccentric. Here is a creditor of another class, whose pleasure is not in his profits but in the gratitude of his clients, who not only forgives men their debts but crowns them with his loving-kindness.

This reading of God's nature appears often both in the teaching and in the behaviour of Jesus. When Simon watched his Guest with the woman at His feet, only two constructions of the scene looked possible: either Jesus did not know what kind of life she had lived and thus showed Himself to be no prophet, or He did not care and thus appeared indifferent to morality. Simon had to make his choice between these two. But what if God is not like men but loftier? and what if this Man of Nazareth is here to show us what God is like? Sir John Seeley remarks that in founding His new society Jesus followed the strange plan of laying men of every degree under a sense of infinite obligation, and He taught that God's Kingdom would be based upon the adoring gratitude of men who owe Him everything. It is worth noticing that when Jesus talks of God's pardon He nowhere suggests anything like a *quid pro quo*—something to be offered or something to be done to make forgiveness possible. Such notions were introduced by theologians long afterwards, when the Church had drifted away from the simple confidence of Jesus that God pardons because it is 'His nature and property to show mercy and to forgive.'

It is not safe in this matter to seek to be wiser than our Lord, or to carry up our hampering precedents and analogies into that world of larger air and clearer sight in which He lived. When, in the name of God, Isaiah has called on sinners to return to a Lord who will abundantly pardon, he adds—'for my thoughts are not your thoughts'—restricted and encumbered and thus without effect.

3. 'Which of them will love him most?' Though Jesus did not set a price upon forgiveness He did look for a reply and a result. In this woman and in all who like her have experienced the magnani-

mity of God He expected some corresponding temper; for magnanimity begets its like, or, as John puts it, 'We love because He loved first.' Without reserve He said to this woman—'Go into peace,' assured of her future, for the love which is the fruit of pardon was already filling her heart, and He was convinced that it would not be blighted.

He knew the human heart too well to be staggered, as His fellow-guests were, by the extravagance of her demeanour. He cordially believed in life, even if it might sometimes run to excess, and what He dreaded most was the torpor of the merely respectable. In Himself He was ever a spendthrift of life, and He loved all who shared in this temper; and when in this woman He perceived that the tides were running in breast-high—hope and gladness and love, He did not cynically reckon that 'what has flowed like the Solway would ebb like its tide.' Bunyan allows a place to what he calls 'dry-eyed duties,' which means such as have nothing of emotion or wonder behind them. But wherever the amazement of God's kindness had been discovered, and love had sprung forth in answer to it, Jesus looked for something great in achievement; for emotion at its noblest is that which inflames and impels and invents.

But does it persist? Is it not bound, in the very nature of the case, to burn itself out? It must be admitted that there is much pitiful experience pointing in this direction; but, though Jesus gave warning of the danger of unsteadfastness, He did not abate His confidence in the renovating power of a generous emotion. The dancing flame of love may die down and yet the steady glow persists. It seems certain that in the Book of Revelation the prophet offers praise 'to him who loves us'; so that the impulse which once launched man or woman forth on ways of gratitude is continually renewed. Certainly love will no longer be content to lie at His feet, it works now and dares and endures for His sake, for emotion can find its worthiest expression in self-forgetting service and even in prosaic fidelities.<sup>1</sup>

#### SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### Privileged Pedestrians.

BY ADJUTANT ARTHUR E. SMITH, SALVATION ARMY, CROYDON.

'And an highway shall be there . . . and the redeemed shall walk there.'—Is 35<sup>8-9</sup>.

This Scripture metaphor is rapidly drawing closer to our lives. We are all road-conscious nowadays.

<sup>1</sup> W. M. Macgregor, *Christ and the Church*, 84.

Speed has largely destroyed our regard for tortuous by-ways. Our energies have been directed toward the construction of arrow-straight highways. Long, straggling mounds of earth mark the burial of some old, winding way and the birth of a highway of more suitable direction and dimension.

In the days of this prophecy, however, the highway as we know it to-day was but a dream. Men moved about in cart ruts. The prophet's visionary highway fully illustrated, as it was intended to do, an approaching condition of safety and well-being for the children of God.

It is a captivating metaphor, and with but little effort one can readily see this great, broad, unswerving highway, golden in the Sun of Righteousness, swept refreshingly by the winds of the Spirit which relieve the fatigue of the faithful. Without undulation, for 'every valley shall be exalted and every mountain abased,' it speaks of the constancy of God. On this highway, free from alarm and disquiet, the redeemed may march, serene in the guarantee of God that no ravenous beast shall be there, nor anything unclean shall pass over it. It is by divine decree eternally exclusive, 'It shall be for THEM'; the redeemed shall walk there.

But let us think for a moment of the tremendous difficulties which have to be faced in the construction of any modern highway. People must be prepared to surrender the settled habits and oft-times prized possessions of long years. There are struggles between the champions of the highway and the obdurate supporters of antiquity, who esteem cobbles above concrete, and resent the uncompromising advance of the highway with its moving barrage of heavy drills and its giant earth-eating jaws, consolidating its gains inch by inch, until, victoriously, the highway cleaves the countryside.

Think of the unrelenting fight which antiquity made against Christ, the Son of God, when He came to found His royal road for the redeemed. There were, as we know, at His coming, many winding ways, and this One Way was to supersede them all. Recognizing this, the champions of antiquity were very quick to fight the innovation. When Jesus, contesting a point said, 'Before Abraham was, I am,' they replied with vigorous scorn, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old.' He was crucified by tyrants of tradition, who saw in the passing of their own system the loss of profits, power, and prestige. They closed their eyes to all the good He did, contested His miracles, and determined at all costs that the hitherto beaten path of their own belief should continue.



Calvary is the mound that marks the beginning of this wonderful highway of Holiness.

Generally speaking, no one asks questions after he has found the highway. Whatever misgivings a traveller may have had in locating the road, once he strikes it he is satisfied. The City may not be in sight, but the experienced traveller knows he can trust the highway. Above all things, there is certainty on the highway. There is certainty on this highway of Holiness. The wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.

Paul did not suggest that he saw a light. He had no doubts about it. There is very little 'suggesting' in the Acts or the Epistles, but the 'I knows,' 'We knows,' and 'Ye knows' abound. We ought to know, and be able to say we know, and this in spite of the sarcasms of any Agrippas about us, or interference of any modern Festus who may desire to dispute with us. 'In that day,' said Jesus, speaking of the coming Comforter and the immediate benefits He would bestow, 'ye shall know.'

One blazing July afternoon, I was standing in a long, dark, ill-ventilated corridor of a public building. I had been waiting some time when an official came around, spraying a strong disinfectant from a powerful syringe. Appreciating the wholesome change in the air after this operation, I thanked him for his service. His reply startled me into serious thought. 'I've pumped this stuff about so long a time,' he said, 'that I have lost all power to smell it for myself.' It may well be that many have been dealing with certain truths for so long a time that they have lost the reality they once held.

It is to the highway we must get, for there is certainty there. The highway has a superior foundation. Directly we find it there is an assuring ring beneath our heels, a voice that speaks of a foundation reaching down to the solid rock.

During the building of St. Paul's Cathedral Wren was remonstrated with because of what was considered the undue regard he was giving to the foundations. 'I am building for posterity,' he replied. The undreamed-of has happened. Under London are the roaring tunnels made by men. It was indeed well that Wren looked to the foundations.

The Bible has some very pointed things to say about foundations. One will suffice us here. 'Behold,' declares Isaiah, 'I lay in Zion a stone . . . a tried stone . . . a sure foundation.' As surely as any foundation-stone must of necessity go down into the darkness and abide alone, so went He down into a darkness that can never be wholly

described, in order that this royal road of the redeemed might become accessible to all believers.

Little did those excavators at Calvary, digging that hole for the base of His cross, dream that they were helping to lay in Zion that tried stone, the sure foundation. In His own wonderful way God makes even the wrath of man to praise Him.

### THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

#### Meek and Lowly in Heart.

'Come unto me, . . . for I am meek and lowly in heart.'—Mt 11<sup>28-30</sup>.

Meek and lowly *in heart*. We often meet people who are meek in outward appearance. See how the shopkeeper appears in the presence of his customer—the very motto of his job is 'The customer is always right.' But he is not always meek and lowly in heart. Sometimes his heart is riotously angry: sometimes it knows a dull, subdued resentment. But Jesus was meek and lowly in heart. No man could move Him from His purpose. He went right on, despite opposition, despite persecution, despite betrayal, and in the end His meekness triumphed even over death. There was nothing passive about the way of Christ. Throughout His life He was engaged upon a great campaign, grappling with the forces of evil.

The foundation of Christian lowliness is the Incarnation. There you see demonstrated the very lowliness of God: men used to speak of God's infinite condescension, but the word has been spoilt for us by the condescension of those who have no right to condescend. God stoops to men, but He does not despise them. Even in the most degraded He sees something of His own handiwork. He loathes their sin, but He wants to win them back to that relationship for which they were created—the relationship of communion with Him. 'Treat one another with the same spirit as you experience in Christ Jesus. Though he was divine by nature, he did not set store upon equality with God, but emptied himself by taking the nature of a servant.'

This lesson of the Incarnation is pressed home in the specific teaching of Jesus. Meekness of heart is the rule for the community that He founded. 'Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority among them. Not so shall it be among you.' The way of the Gentiles has a great following in the modern world. But the Church must ever reject its subtle attraction. In the Christian community Christ would have us God-reliant. In

the world outside we are witnessing a feverish production of new things to rely upon. Armament factories work overtime. Men feel that they can rely upon big guns. Foreign correspondents or foreign newspapers are banished from a country. Men feel that they can rely upon the form of lying that is called propaganda. Racial myths gain an amazing currency. Men feel that they can rely upon racial superiority. 'After all, we're better than a pack of Jews.' Men spend their lives for the gathering of money. 'After all, when you're in a tight corner, there's nothing like cash.' 'After all these things do the Gentiles seek.' All of them are substitutes for God. The Christian can be steadfast because he is relying upon God. His house is built upon a rock.

Meekness, then, does not mean a lack of vitality. It means a vitality controlled, an economy of vitality. It means a vitality controlled by God. We would have had things to say to Pilate, stinging words of condemnation for the ruler who was afraid to rule, and for the population whose anger had been so swiftly inflamed. A fine sarcastic speech we might have made, with all the right references to the herd instinct. But Jesus had the strength to be silent. And when they put Him upon the Cross, His first words were, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' Was there ever such meekness? Was there ever such strength? Truly this was the Son of God.

Here surely is a pattern for the Church. If only Churchmen could learn from their Master to be silent under provocation, how much stronger the Church would be:

He shall not be loud and noisy,  
he shall not shout in public;  
he shall not crush a broken reed,  
nor quench a wick that dimly burns.

Such were the marks of Jesus throughout His life, as He faced the Cross that life involved. They have been the marks of many a Christian saint.

The first General Booth was one who did a very great deal of shouting in public. But he had caught the essential spirit of the Suffering Servant. His son recorded, 'When I have gone to him, perhaps, with some infamous newspaper attack, and in my indignation have said, "This is really more than we can stand," he has replied, "Bramwell, fifty years hence it will matter very little indeed how these people treated us: it will matter a great deal how we dealt with the work of God."' And when some one inquired why his Army was able to do what no other organization at that

time could do, his reply was simple: 'You see, we have no reputation to lose.'

It may be that a Church 'with no reputation to lose,' unafraid to be constrained by the meekness of Christ—who made Himself of no reputation—will be best able to face the new forces that are alive in the world to-day. 'There is nothing more exhilarating,' says Kagawa, 'than to walk through the world unencumbered. . . . That is the way to walk.' Probably few statements in the New Testament would be greeted with more derision by a large number of persons to-day than Christ's blessing upon the meek. This is mainly due to two causes, first the idealization of force, and the consequent belief that it is the best means for attaining ends that may be desirable in themselves; and secondly, a crude worship of the superman, with his so-called 'virility' which is in itself a recrudescence of a debased form of hero-worship. The Christian does not idealize force. He recognizes the force of love. He does not worship a fictitious superman. He falls low in adoration before the living Christ. He knows that the way of Christ is called hopeless idealism by those who follow the way of the world. He quite recognizes that it is idealism. For him it is the one thing in the world that has any hope about it.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has told a fine story of the late Bishop Talbot: 'Just before I left Leeds I was talking to a typical downright, good-hearted, self-made business man who kept his Yorkshire speech. "I can't make nowt o' that Vicar. He's a good man right enoof, and a clever, I suppose; but he's too 'oomble for the likes of uz; we want a strong man i' Leeds." I merely said, "Wait a year or two and you'll change your mind." Returning to Leeds just before the Vicar's departure for Rochester, I met my friend again. He had no recollection, though I had, of our previous conversation. But he said, "Nay, it's a bad business is this o' t'owd Vicar goin'. He's gotten a hold o' this place, sure enoof. He's taught *me* summat I never thowt, that it's the 'oomble man that's strong.'"

There, it seems to me, is the essentially Christian note. The Jewish leaders found Jesus strong—so strong that they were afraid—or they would never have put Him to death.

Behind the meekness of Jesus there must have lain a tremendous self-discipline. Some glimpses of it we gain from the story of the Temptation. He could have won the world by the world's way. But that would not have been to win it for God. He might have cast Himself from the Temple.



Every one then would have accepted Him. But no jumping from the Temple would teach them that God was their Father. He might have given the disaffected classes bread. They would have followed Him to a man. But no amount of bread would teach them the necessity for self-sacrifice: food might build their bodies—it would not change their hearts. Perhaps we, too, might win the world by the world's way.

'The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.' That glory still shines for our beholding, though we see only through a glass, darkly. He is meek and lowly in heart. His yoke fits aright. In His service is the perfection of freedom.<sup>1</sup>

#### FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### Kneeling and Standing.

BY THE REVEREND G. HOLLAND WILLIAMS, M.A.,  
LITTLE SUTTON, CHESHIRE.

'And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead.'  
—Rev 1<sup>7</sup>.

'But rise, and stand upon thy feet.'—Ac 26<sup>16</sup>.

Each of these verses describes the climax to a vision. The first takes us to the island of Patmos. John, an exile for Christ's sake, beholds in a trance seven golden candlesticks, and in the midst of them 'One like unto the Son of man . . . His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire . . . and his voice as the sound of many waters' . . . and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength. And, John concludes, 'when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead.'

The second verse takes us to the road between Jerusalem and Damascus. Saul of Tarsus is on his way to Damascus armed with authority to arrest and convey to Jerusalem any of his fellow-countrymen who have turned Christian. It is one of the most eventful journeys in all history, and one of the most ironical. For this man, who sets out on his journey in order to apprehend Christians, is himself apprehended by Christ before he comes to his journey's end. 'I saw in the way a light from heaven. . . . And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice . . . Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And I said, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But rise, and stand upon thy feet.'

Here, then, we have two men each of whom sees

a vision of Christ. But whereas the vision of Christ brings John to his knees, the same vision brings Paul to his feet. We must not say that either response was more fitting than the other. Both attitudes of soul are eternally right and eternally necessary, and our Christian experience is immature unless both have their rightful place within it. The contemplation of Christ ought to bring us to our knees in fear and trembling; but, equally, our response to the vision ought to be that we spring to our feet erect and fearless, and ready for any service which He may demand.

1. The vision of Christ ought to bring us to our knees. 'We have very efficiently pared the claws of the Lion of Judah,' writes Miss Dorothy Sayers, 'certified him "meek and mild," and recommended Him as a fitting household pet for pale curates and pious old ladies.' But this was not the Christ whom the disciples companied with, and whom the common people and the Pharisees knew. Before that Christ, the authentic Christ, men sometimes trembled as did John on Patmos. It is true that children were at home in His company; that publicans and sinners found Him ready to befriend them; that folk who came to Him with their needs found Him accessible, and that He put them at their ease. But, on the other hand, there was a day when Simon Peter felt himself overwhelmed by something which He discerned in Jesus, and fell down at His feet saying, 'Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.' And there was another day when an angry mob sought to cast Him down headlong to death, because of the searching words which He had spoken, but fell back before Him in awe, and let Him go unharmed. There was something about Jesus, as men sometimes discovered to their cost, before which they were left quelled and overawed, and with nothing to say.

If we have never trembled in the presence of Christ, there has been something lacking in our apprehension of Him. If we are able to come before Him with jaunty self-confidence, or to respond to Him with sugary piety, then we have not seen Him as He is. It is true that He invites us with 'comfortable words' to come to Him. It is true that, as Luther wrote, 'There never was in heaven or earth a more loving, familiar, or milder man, especially towards poor, sorrowful, and tormented consciences.' It is true that He calls His disciples not servants, but friends. But with all this, He is also the First and the Last and the Living One, of whom, and through whom, and unto whom are all things. With all this, He is also the Holy and the True, the Word of God quick to

<sup>1</sup> H. G. G. Herklots, *The Yoke of Christ*, 107.

discern the thoughts and intents of the heart, before whom our hidden sins lie naked and manifest. With all this, He is still the Lord, who comes to us with an absolute demand, and has the right to ask of us whatsoever He will. And, therefore, with all the boldness which we may rightly have towards Him, we need that reverence and godly fear which makes us, like John, ready to fall at His feet as dead.

2. But the vision of Christ ought also to bring us to our feet. When we look to the lives of the New Testament Christians we find them rejoicing in the new status which Christ has conferred upon them. They tell us that they are no longer slaves, but freemen and sons of God, and that they have a right to come with boldness to the throne of grace. Are they, then, casually familiar and presumptuous in their dealings with the Lord? No; but neither do they grovel before Him. They know that they have been loved with an everlasting love, and that Christ died for them and bought them with a great price. And inevitably, therefore, they have 'a good conceit of themselves,' a sense of their own worth which rests on the grateful, humble recognition of what Christ has done for them, undeserving as they are. And the same realization that He loved *us*, and gave Himself for *us*, ought to bring us also to our feet, not in any spirit of arrogance but in the glad confidence that, though we are nothing in ourselves, yet we matter to Him, since He for us did not disdain to die.

And together with this boldness towards God there should also go a resoluteness towards men. Saintliness is not to be equated with spinelessness. The man who has seen Christ is one who stands upon his feet in his dealings with his fellow-men. Not only should we not fear what men may do unto us; we should not allow men to do unto us all the harm which they may wish to do. 'Though a Christian is not to be quarrelsome,' wrote poor, gentle William Cowper, 'he is not to be crushed; though he is but a worm, he is not such a worm as every selfish, unprincipled wretch may tread upon at his pleasure.' And the more we have seen Christ as He is, the Strong Son of God, the more shall we ourselves become strong with His strength; and the less, therefore, will men be able to treat us evilly with impunity. It was of this hidden firmness in the character of the man who has seen Christ that Coventry Patmore was thinking when he wrote: 'On the whole, the saint will give you an agreeable impression of inferiority to yourself. You must not, however, presume upon this inferiority so far as to offer him any affront, for he

will be sure to answer you with some quiet and unexpected remark, showing a presence of mind—arising, I suppose, from the presence of God—which will make you feel that you have struck rock and only shaken your own shoulder.' The true saint, for all his Christian gentleness, is not a man to be trifled with.

But the attitude of standing upon our feet symbolizes not only boldness towards God and robustness towards men, but also preparedness for service. It is 'the alert position.' It signifies willingness to attempt any task which God may appoint and readiness to set about it at any moment. And, ultimately, it is in order to produce this spirit within us that all visions of Christ are given us. It was in order to make a willing servant of Saul that the vision was given to him on the Damascus road. 'For I have appeared unto thee for this purpose,' said the Voice, 'to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee.' And whatever visions and glimpses of Christ we may be granted, their purpose is, likewise, that we may offer ourselves willingly in the work of the Kingdom. They are given not for entertainment but for inspiration. They are given not to be enjoyed but to be translated into action. God forbid, then, that we should be content merely to luxuriate in the contemplation of Christ without responding to the challenge implicit in the heavenly vision. Rather, may we be found rising to our feet, and praying, 'Teach us, good Lord, to serve Thee as Thou deservest; to give and not to count the cost; to fight and not to heed the wounds; to toil and not to seek for rest; to labour and not to ask for any reward, save that of knowing that we do Thy Will.'

#### FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

##### Christ's Challenge to Failure.

'Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing: nevertheless at thy word I will let down the net.'—Lk 5<sup>5</sup>.

When Peter began his reply, it was in the mind with which we are well acquainted in these days. 'We have toiled all the night.' For all the sacrifice, men say as they look out on the world to-day, things appear worse than ever, and it seems hopeless to try to better them. But when Peter ended, he was away on a different line altogether, the outcome of which was a success, after failure, that was beyond his dreams. Clearly, something had happened in Peter's mind, between these points,



and as clearly we need to get on to Peter's new line. The conversion of Peter, between the first part of his speech and the second, is the conversion of which the Church and Christian people stand most in need to-day. What did Peter recognize and acknowledge in Christ that made the difference? The secret of the Christ lies in the answer.

But may we not put it in this way—Peter acknowledged an authority of some kind in Christ to deal with his night's failure? The Master quietly brushed aside the fact that they had toiled all night in vain. And when Peter declared that at Christ's word he would let down the net again, he was acknowledging His authority to take his past failure into His Hands and make of it what He would.

This is not far-fetched. Jesus did, and does, make such a claim. He refused to accept Peter's report of the night's fishing as the final fact, or even the most important one. In place of that, He sets, as of far greater moment, a promise of something better, in a new situation, *which now includes Him*.

Jesus made this claim again and again. And when it was acknowledged and acted upon, results followed which we call miraculous. For instance, He said to a man with a withered arm, 'Stretch it out.' The man might have replied that he could not, and all the hard material facts of his past up till then would have supported him. But Jesus tacitly sets them all aside as One having authority over them. These are not the important facts for Him. What He puts in their place is this fact—that He *knew* the man could do it now, if he tried. And he did!

'Arise,' He once said to a paralytic, 'take up thy bed and walk.' And again the miracle happened!

But, you say, these are physical, and perhaps psychical, and cases not unlike them have occurred without any reference or appeal to Christ. Well, take a purely religious instance. To the woman that was a sinner, at Simon's table, Jesus spoke a word of peace and forgiveness. He said, 'Go and sin no more.' We think of the past life she had led, and we say it can't be done. We look back in fact. But Christ looked forward. Pointing to the future, He said, 'You can and you will now.' And she went out to a new life of purity, and of passionate devotion to the glory of the love of God which she had seen in the face of Jesus Christ. Isn't it clear that Jesus did claim to cancel and set aside past hopelessness or failure or sin, and that when men and women yielded to His power, and acted on His authority, wonderful things happened?

This is a word that the sad and burdened need.

It is only, perhaps, when sorrow has come home to us that we realize how much of it there is in the world, and how many of our friends are carrying heavy burdens. Can we imagine what the attitude of Jesus would be if we took our trouble to Him? If the New Testament is a witness, He would persuade us to look forward, not back. He would brush the trouble aside—not roughly, for He knows how it hurts—but He would quietly lift it from the chief place, and in its room would set this—the men and women we can be yet, and the service that, through Him, we may render to God and man. We should come out from our interview, saying, 'Well, I don't understand, but Jesus expects me to rise and follow Him. And I will.'

This is a word that failure needs. The world either blames its failures, or fires them out. But Jesus quietly ignores failure, in the interest of the success which He knows can yet come with Him. He sends back the same men, to the same place, with the same old boat and nets. There's a power in Him which constantly challenges the complaints of failure and weaves them into hopes and promises, so that from fellowship with Him, men come out to try again. And that is not failure, even though they may be getting but few fish.

This is a word needed by everybody. Nobody can say that Jesus ever condoned or belittled sin. But when men and women took their sins and shortcomings to Him, in humble penitence, there was, again, that authoritative and most gracious setting aside of the past, and all the emphasis laid on the possibilities of the future with Him. Jesus was more concerned with what the prodigal could be yet, than inclined to remind him of what he had been. In the story of the Prodigal, indeed, which He told to show us the grace of God, the father interrupts the lad's pitiful confession of his foolishness. It hurts the father's heart to hear it. And now that the boy had come home, it mattered less than the new life of fellowship and loyalty that was possible in the years to come. When we repent and confess, that is God's attitude. It isn't what we have been and are that counts supremely for Him, but what we can be yet, if we have the courage and faith to take Him at His word, and go out to live and love and serve as forgiven sons of God in this world of His. It's when a man who knows that he has sinned, looks to Christ, and then goes on, like Peter, 'Nevertheless at thy word . . .' it is then that the world stands a chance of seeing what is, after all, the ultimate miracle, an erring life being redeemed by the Love of God.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. Alexander, *By Sun and Candle-Light*, 35.

## After Fifty Years.

### VII. The Chronology of the New Testament.

BY THE REVEREND T. NICKLIN, M.A., RINGWOOD, HANTS.

IN few departments of Biblical study has the last half century given us more contributions of sterling value than in the Chronology of the New Testament. Fifty years ago Archbishop Usher's datings were still traditional, if challenged in some quarters. The determination of the date of the Nativity made by Dionysius Exiguus had been seen to be irreconcilable with St. Matthew's unequivocal statement that Herod the Great was alive at the time. A compromise had accordingly been effected by dating the Nativity in 4 B.C. It was disputed whether Herod died in 4 or in 3 B.C. The Baptism was assigned to A.D. 26, and Tiberius' reign held to be reckoned from 1 January, 12, when he was associated with Augustus in the sovereignty. Some still held that the Baptism was in 29 and the Crucifixion in 33. Hort with considerable hesitation had declined to accept the theory of a one year ministry of our Lord, but the criticism which denied credence to St. Luke's assertion of a census under Quirinius at the Nativity had been countered by Mommsen's claim that a mutilated inscription recently discovered was evidence that Quirinius was twice proconsul of Syria, so that he might have supervised another census prior to the notorious business of A.D. 6. This was the position when Mr. (afterwards Professor) C. H. Turner wrote his article in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. Mr. Turner successfully proved that Herod died in the Spring of 4 (not 3) B.C., and he disposed of Hort's view of a one year ministry and directed attention anew to Tertullian's untroubled ascription to Sentius Saturninus of the census at the Nativity. Accordingly, Mr. Turner argued that the Birth might well be in 7 B.C. He was therefore constrained in view of our Lord's age as estimated by St. Luke to seek to find earlier dates for the Baptism and consequently for the Crucifixion than had been generally postulated. Reckoning Tiberius' reign from his association with Augustus in the tribuneship in A.D. 11, he placed the first preaching of the Baptist in 25 or 26, and the Crucifixion on 18th March, 29. He dismissed the testimony of the Gnostic scholars Valentinus, Basileidis, and Heracleon. He discounted the evidence of Irenæus as resting upon the puny intelligence of Papias, and he dismissed Dionysius

Exiguus because he was not earlier than the 6th century. Nevertheless he so well marshalled his argument that it very largely held the field for a quarter of a century. He was apparently unaware of the high value of Julius Africanus and Georgius Syncellus as chronographers, a value substantiated by the fidelity of their testimony to Manetho's work on the Egyptian Dynasties. Nor did he observe that Phlegon's dating of the eclipse cannot be placed before July, 29, so that its testimony to 33 for the Crucifixion cannot be exploded. It should be added that the parallel of Easter tables has somewhat misled him. The Jewish celebration of every New Moon was a check on their calendar and the situation at Tisri was a guide as to the need of intercalating a Ve-Adar. Moreover, full moon can generally be observed if the New Moon cannot.

More serious was the apparent oversight of St. Luke's equalling of St. John's call not simply to Tiberius' 15th year but to Pilate's procuratorship. This can only be forced to begin in July, 26, if we suppose his ten years complete of office to end in July, 36 (he was on his way back to Rome after his recall when Tiberius died in March, 37). Turner, however, insists elsewhere that for the writers of antiquity ten years would mean anything over nine but less than ten years, so that Pilate's procuratorship should begin not earlier than February, 27. In effect this means that Turner's assertion that the ancients would mean by ten years that period *or less* makes it doubtful if Pilate's procuratorship can have begun before 1st July, 27. It may be added that (to anticipate what will be urged lower down) it seems to be very doubtful whether any evidence can be found of the regnal years of the Roman Emperors being reckoned from any date other than that of their predecessors' demise. Not only do Clement of Alexandria and the other early Christian writers make Tiberius' 15th year correspond to 28-29, but Josephus, a contemporary of St. Luke, does the same.

Apparently Turner also was unaware that dating by the Egyptian vague year continued for centuries after the Alexandrine interlocking of the Egyptian with the Julian calendar, and in conse-



quence overlooked the significance of Clement's testimony.

When we pass to the Chronology of the New Testament after the first Whitsunday little need be said as to the views generally held fifty years ago or Turner's datings. New evidence has disposed of many dates as will presently be shown. Much of Turner's reasoning is solidly corrective of his predecessors, but his discussion of Ramsay's brilliant attempt to deduce the date of St. Paul's imprisonment is vitiated by the assumption on *a priori* grounds that the Jews must have had a calendar which they followed without regard to observation. All the evidence goes to show that the ancients, where they had a formal calendar, did not allow their datings to stray wildly from the astronomical realities which observation enabled them to check.

In 1899 was published the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. For this, two continental scholars, Marti and von Soden, were invited to write on the Chronology of the New Testament. By a curious irony, while Turner was rejecting the arguments for a one year ministry, they urged them again, making apt and just comments on the curious character of the Greek text in Jn 5<sup>1</sup> and 6<sup>4</sup>.<sup>1</sup> Concise and lucid, however, though their treatment of the entire subject is, they contributed nothing of permanent value to the stock of material for arriving at a sound estimate and so far as English scholarship is concerned their contentions have had no special influence. This can be seen, *e.g.*, from Dummelow's one volume Commentary published just before the Great War, which attempting nothing more than a curt summary of accepted dates ignores everything, it may be said, except Turner's views.

By the time that Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* appeared in 1906, some of the doubts of twenty years before had cleared away. Papyrus census papers from Egypt had supplied evidence of registration at one's place of birth instead of one's domicile and before the censuses of A.D. 34, 20, 6, a census in 9 B.C. was admissible. Ramsay, Sanday, Dr. Kirsopp Lake, Fotheringham, all made contributions towards the sifting of the evidence and the solution of the various problems.

In the *Dictionary* Mr. Montgomery Hitchcock laid his account with this fresh evidence. Like Turner he turned his back on the old view of a

lengthy public ministry, but he did more. He proposed to re-arrange the events in the first few months after the Baptism and in connexion with this gave a novel and, as it must seem, an improbable interpretation to the words 'On the third day' in Jn 2<sup>1</sup>. With some fanciful references to astrological possibilities which he suggested, we need not concern ourselves, and may regard the article as merely registering the dominance at this date of Turner's theories. Meanwhile, as regards the dates of St. Paul's life, the range of uncertainty was somewhat narrowed when there was discovered at Delphi a record of a letter from the Emperor Claudius, who had then for the twenty-sixth time been hailed as emperor. This letter was dated at the same time as written, when Gallio was proconsul of Achaia. Since Claudius was hailed as emperor for the twenty-fourth time, according to Ramsay, early in A.D. 52 and for the twenty-seventh in December of that year, the letter can only belong to the middle of that year. The rule at that time was that proconsuls held office for one year only, apparently from 1st July. Ramsay estimated Gallio's year from April, 52 to April, 53; Duff from July, 51 to July, 52. It would seem more reasonable to choose July, 52 to July, 53 as the year in which the twenty-sixth hailing of the emperor occurred. In this case the Jerusalem Council will have been in A.D. 50 and St. Paul's conversion in 33 or 36, according as we date the Crucifixion in 30 or 33, and exclude or include the three years spent in Arabia in the fourteen years before St. Paul re-visited Jerusalem.

In 1928 appeared Peake's one volume *Commentary* and Gore's *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Dr. Grieve in the former and Dr. Lowther Clarke in the latter both prefer 29 for the Crucifixion, and both place St. Paul's stay at Corinth in 50-52.

Dr. Grieve dates St. Paul's conversion either in 30 or in 37: Dr. Lowther Clarke dates it in 33. (It should be noted that he again puts the case for a one year ministry.)

In 1933, however, the fifth volume of Drs. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake appeared. In this an exhaustive examination of the subject was made. It was made clear that the twenty-fourth imperial acclamation was between 25th January, 51 and 24th January, 52, while the twenty-seventh acclamation was between 25th January, 52 and 24th January, 53. Pending the discovery of fresh evidence, it was therefore established that Gallio was proconsul in the summer of 52. Further than this we have no solid warrant for going, but as a provisional and precarious hypothesis we may perhaps date Gallio's proconsulship from July, 52 to

<sup>1</sup> It may be noticed that Irenæus' reference to Jn 5<sup>1</sup> for the evidence of a third Passover may indicate that in his text ch. 5 followed ch. 6. This is consonant with a later insertion of 'the Passover' in 6<sup>4</sup> when the present MS. order was established.

July, 53. Besides this the other cardinal dates in the Acts of the Apostles are discussed, but here further investigation and consideration seems still to be required, for two reasons. First, chronological arrangement in a historian is not identical with the annalistic method, and secondly, insufficient recognition has been given by critics to the use of the aorist in Greek where we English resort to a pluperfect.<sup>1</sup> There is room, therefore, still for the reconstruction of the story so that we have (1) Agabus' prophecy of a famine; (2) Peter's arrest, Passover (43 or) 44; (3) Peter's retirement to Antioch, Paul's reprimand of him, Peter's departure to Rome; (4) the rest of the Twelve disperse from Jerusalem, before autumn (43 or) 44; (5) death of Herod between summer (43 or) 44 and January, 45; (6) visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem while none of the Twelve was there 45 or 46; (7) famine in Judaea 46.

Some general observations may perhaps be permitted upon this review of the trend of opinion in the past half century in regard to the Chronology of the New Testament. As we have seen, one date at any rate has come to command almost universal acceptance.

Despite this appearance of conclusions at last generally accepted, there are reasons for hesitancy and for desiring further consideration. Scholars of the Roman obedience have pronounced for 33 as the year of the Crucifixion, and in 1935 Dr. Fotheringham demonstrated that no other year will allow a Passover observance on a Friday night. It must be observed that very few writers approach the problem with independent experience of ancient lunar calendars, such as the Attic and the Roman Republican Calendars. Hence they repeat assertions of the uncertainty of observations as a basis for a calendar. Two writers have even suggested that Julius Cæsar's extended year in 46 B.C. may have added to the difficulties of the problem! Moreover, there is need to examine the narratives of the Gospels in their entirety and not merely the prominent signposts for dates. Similarly the complete statements of early writers need consideration and not detached quotations from them. To give one example, Clement of Alexandria, if read with attention, testifies to certain undisputed datings, viz :

(1) The Baptism was on Tybi 15 (or 11), and, mistakenly or not (see below) he makes the year 28-29.

(2) The Nativity was on Pachon (or Pharmuthi) 25th. He mistakenly makes the year 3-2 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> Examples are to be seen in Mk 14<sup>3</sup> and Ac 12<sup>1</sup>.

because he makes our Lord exactly 30 years old on the day of His Baptism.

(3) The Crucifixion was on Phamenoth or Pharmuthi 25th (or perhaps Pharmuthi 19th) and mistakenly or not he makes the year 29-30.

A few comments must be made. Three friars lanterns have continually lured the Chronologists of the Gospels into theories which must be held responsible for the confusion of the subject. (a) St. Luke's thirty years for our Lord's age has in defiance of his warning that it was a round figure been treated as precisely exact. (b) The prophetic words 'the accepted year of the Lord' generated the belief that there was a one year ministry. (c) A saying in Daniel gave rise to a notion that the Gospel dates could be ascertained or checked by correct interpretation of that book. It may be doubted whether all the datings of the Crucifixion in 29 should not be understood as confirmations of Clement's understanding of Tiberius' fifteenth year as 28-29.

The duration of the ministry must be deduced from the Gospels themselves, and the present writer believes that fully examined these require a three years' and perhaps allow a fourth year ministry. The date for the Baptism is equivalent to December 29th or 25th in the years 26 and 27, to December 28th and 24th in the years 28-31.

For the Nativity, Mackinlay has pointed out that to get a census of Jews a feast would be the most suitable: sheep are out from April to October: Saturninus was proconsul 10-7 B.C. Clement's figures give a date on which Pentecost would fall in 8 B.C. Mackinlay confirms this date further by pointing out that the course of Abijah would have been on duty in the Temple in the week 27th January to 2nd February, 9 B.C., so that the Baptist may have been born on 8th November, 9 B.C.

It may be noted that Irenæus undesignedly testifies to the Nativity in 8 B.C. and the Crucifixion in A.D. 33. Thirty years from 8 B.C. lead to A.D. 23 for the Baptism, after which a ministry of ten years gives 33 for the Crucifixion when our Lord would be in his fortieth year.

Here it must be observed that while in the West the Julian calendar once introduced was regularly used to calculate and register stabilized datings, in the East, the vague Egyptian year (not the Alexandrine reformed year) was employed for the same purpose. Josephus followed this method, as we can see when he makes the length of Augustus' reign fifty-seven years, six months and one day—from 15th March, 44 B.C. to 29th August, 14. We have overrunning the exact fifty-seven years



16+30+31+30+31+29 days reckoned on the Julian scale. This sum of 167 days increased by the fourteen days for the shift of the Egyptian vague year gives Josephus' figure. Similarly, Clement of Alexandria makes the interval from the Nativity to Commodus' death on 31st December, 192 to be 194 years, one month, thirteen days. It is this use of differing calendars which led to the West placing the Nativity on 25th December, while the East placed it on 6th January. In this we may find the cause of Hippolytus' alterations in his date for the Crucifixion.

We may suggest that he first knew the theory of the Baptism 28th-29th December, 28, and the Crucifixion 6th-7th<sup>1</sup> April, 30. He learnt the alternative date (25th December, accepted in the West) and therefore put the Crucifixion on 2nd April, thus bringing both dates forward by four days. Later he was convinced that if the Julian date were accepted 25th December instead of the Eastern 6th January for the Baptism, 6th April for the Crucifixion must be altered to 25th March, to keep the same interval between the two dates.

There is thus no shred of excuse so far as tradition goes for dating the Crucifixion on 18th March, A.D. 29. Epiphanius' statement that he had seen copies of the *Acta Pilati* in which 18th March replaced 25th March is of little value for arriving at the original text, and 25th March as we have seen is itself a testimony to the date 7th April. As for the year, the Jewish year 29-30 may be equated as reasonably with the consuls of 29 as may the Jewish year 28-29.

A few words must be given to the much-vexed statement in Jn 2<sup>20</sup>. Abbott argued that the Jews would not have been content to regard the Temple as a new erection by Herod, and he therefore supposed that the building finished in 513 B.C. was erroneously reckoned to have been begun when Cyrus became prince of Anshan in 559 B.C. If this were so, we should not need to concern ourselves further with it. Turner reckoned from the time that Herod began his extension of the Second Temple and this he placed in 20-19 B.C. Later investigators<sup>2</sup> have demonstrated that his arguments

are untenable and that this date must be 23-22 B.C. Further, Turner disregarded Josephus' clear statement that Herod's building was completed in eight years. Nevertheless the dative case remains a difficulty. It can hardly alter the translation 'the work of building lasted through forty-six years' nor, again, according to the ordinary use 'forty-six years ago the work was finished.' The uses of the dative are to express, (1) time when, (2) time within which, and (3) time before or after some date. The second use is entirely consonant with Abbott's view. The work of building had interruptions, but its commencement and its end were separated by forty-six years. The third use may conceivably be involved to yield the sense of 'forty-six years ago' if we supply an unexpressed  $\pi\rho\delta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \nu\upsilon\nu$ , e.g., 'before this present time.' This second interpretation is indeed unsatisfactory from the standpoint of sense. The riposte is so oblique as to be, to most Western minds, inept and pointless. Rabbinic arguments, however, are not always logical in the Western sense, and we may therefore accept the following schemes of Chronology.

Nisān 40 <sup>3</sup>	to	Herod's 1st year, reckoned from his proclamation in December, 40.
Adār 39		
Nisān 37	to	Herod's 1st year, from his accession
Adār 36		in Tishrī, 37.
Nisān 23	to	Temple building begun in the 18th
Adār 22		or 15th year.
Nisān 16	to	Temple finished 8 years later.
Adār 15		
Nisān 4	to	Herod's death; Archelaus' 1st
Adār 3		year.
Nisān 6	to	Archelaus deposed.
Adār 7		
Nisān 30	to	Forty-six years from the completion
Adār 31		of the Temple.
Nisān 27	to	Pontius Pilate's 1st year from July,
Adār 28		27.
Nisān 36	to	Pilate's 10th year, recalled in the
Adār 37		winter 36-37.

If we might dare to adopt this second interpretation and to discard Abbott's, we could eliminate some of the hypotheses otherwise left open. The Baptism would have been on 6th January, 30 (or possibly 25th or 29th December, 29), the wedding in Cana on Wednesday 22nd February, the Passover of Jn 2 on Wednesday 8th March, and the Crucifixion on 3rd April, 33.

<sup>3</sup> It will be found that no other account of the year's beginning will admit of the reconciliations of Josephus' datings with the placing in A.D. 30 of the Passover of Jn 2<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius notes that down to his own time one Christian denomination used a fixed Easter falling on 6th April.

<sup>2</sup> Fr. T. Corbishley in *Journal of Theological Studies*, Jan., 1935, and Dr. F. J. Badcock in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, Oct., 1935. The former has certainly explained the discrepancies in Josephus' statement of Herod's regnal years. They countenanced the feasibility of Abbott's hypothesis.

## Puritanism.

BY THE REVEREND DAVID HOUSTON, M.A., GIFFNOCK, GLASGOW.

It is generally agreed that the self-reliance which distinguishes the British from other races is due to the influence of the Puritan discipline.

What the Pilgrim Fathers accomplished in New England is well known. They carried with them a bit of the Puritan dough and leavened therewith the Continent of America. A modern instance, less known but impressive also, is recorded by the German officer Bloem who witnessed it. After the battle of the Marne when the German army had dug itself in behind the Aisne, a party of German officers were watching the approach of their enemies advancing on the other side of the river. An unusual sight arrested their attention—waves of dark spots moving across the plain. The dark spots turned out to be soldiers deploying in waves thirty yards apart, each soldier at a distance of ten yards from his neighbour. The German guns immediately opened fire, but the waves moved steadily forward. The observers were filled with astonishment. They could scarcely believe their eyes. The narrator remarked to his companions, 'There's a manoeuvre impossible to German troops. They are as brave as the British, but they must fight shoulder to shoulder. They cannot be made to advance ten yards apart.'

It was British individuality, Puritan discipline in the blood.

This iron quality is peculiar to the Briton. It has been observed in the Pilgrim emigrants of the seventeenth century, in the British soldier of the twentieth, in the accomplishments of British men and women in the periods in between. But here is a paradox: Puritanism universally recognized as an incomparable influence on character has, nevertheless, as a type of conduct been maligned, perverted, and hated. The marvels it has accomplished have been universally recognized, the hatred it has aroused has been equally widespread. History supplies few examples of heroic endurance comparable to those of the Puritans, but we search in vain for a human type more detested.

Continental writers interested in the rise and progress of the British Empire and undisturbed by insular sectarianism have freely acknowledged the value of the Puritan influence in our achievement, but as a moulder of aggressive character only. As a driving force in commerce, as a stimulant to

selfish exploitation—'Certainly,' as a benign and elevating influence—'No.' Puritanism they hold has sustained the Briton in his self-complacency as member of the 'Chosen Race,' as exclusive agent of Providence. John Bull on his knees is a sight to make the foreigner shudder!

If the permanent elements of Puritanism are to be recovered from the accumulations under which they have been obscured, a new line of defence must be adopted. Time has revealed the incapacity of its rivals—Rousseauism, Communism, Humanism, and the like—to construct a satisfactory scheme of things; but this does not mean that their criticisms against Puritanism are all irrelevant. Those criticisms must not be explained away but accepted where valid. They do not affect the essential core of Puritanism but only its temporary accretions. To vary the words of Lord Tweedsmuir applied to Democracy, we have to purge the defects and establish the essential and enduring principles of Puritanism. To do this some extrication is necessary.

The names Calvinism and Puritanism, for example, are often used as synonyms for the same thing, but we would avoid confusion if we restrict the word 'Calvinism' to principles, to the interpretation of life which Calvin derived from Scripture, using Puritanism for the type of conduct founded on those principles: Calvinism the theory, Puritanism the practice. Practice always comes short of its creed, so it would be unfair to blame the first for the shortcomings of the second. Calvinism has its own defects as an interpretation of life, but it is not to be saddled with 'Holy Willie,' nor for that matter is Puritanism itself, if rightly understood, to be burdened with the shame of his excesses. Again, it has to be remembered, Calvinism is four hundred years old. Calvin gave to the world a revised interpretation of life. He did for the Hebrew Prophets what the New Learning did for the Greek thinkers; but between his time and ours much water has run below the bridge. The change is particularly obvious in our way of thinking. So great is this change that the mental background of the seventeenth-century thinker has become almost inconceivable to us. Bacon, Descartes, Newton, and Darwin come in between.

Looking at Puritanism with these and similar cautions, we find it to be an amalgam of ingredients



of varying value, some temporary creations of the time, to be discarded, others of essential and permanent value, to be retained.

Examples of the first are an inadequate view of Revelation, a perverted view of Election, a claim to superiority, a tendency to judge others, a leaning towards hypocrisy. The first two are theoretical defects; they belong to Calvinism. The others are defects of conduct; they belong to Puritanism. Of permanent elements in both may be named Purity and Grace which latter includes faith, repentance, conversion, the transformed individual and his responsibility.

In considering the attitude of Calvinism to Revelation we must keep in mind the change in our way of thinking, as has been suggested. The men of the sixteenth century accepted tests of certainty which to us are inadequate, to say the least. The method of reaching conclusions from ascertained facts had not dawned upon the men of that time. They were not concerned with facts so much as with their own mental attitude. They reasoned downwards from accepted notions not upwards as we do from observation and experience. To quote a recent writer, 'They selected arbitrarily a set of first principles, they subordinated their studies to them, they established thereby an intellectual dictatorship and killed the freedom of the mind.' 'God is perfect,' they affirmed, therefore His book *must* be perfect. Their notion of what is 'perfect' was vague and erroneous. They did not know that the orbit of things lies outside human dogmas and does not conform to human wishes or expectations.

When it was found that the Bible was not 'perfect' according to Calvinistic conviction, then the Calvinistic view of Revelation became suspect. The ground was prepared for competing theories which rejected the idea of Revelation altogether. But we must beware of a fallacy here. A defective theory does not necessarily annihilate the *fact* upon which it is formed. Revelation is a fact in spite of the narrow views of Puritans concerning it. On the other hand, the discovery of error in a competing theory does not necessarily substantiate the truth of the discoverer's theory as is often supposed. We have reason to believe that Revelation, the outgoing of the divine intelligence and power, is as wide as the universe itself. The Bible supports this view: 'Darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' This was early, at the beginning of things. We believe further that Revelation was progressive with adaptation suited to the occasions to which it came. 'Many were the

forms and fashions in which God spoke of old to our fathers.' It was not easy to separate Revelation from the earthen vessels into which it was poured nor to distinguish the divine from the human elements with which it was mingled.

The Jews received a special Revelation concerning life which Christianity enlarged and perfected; but the Puritans by restricting revelation to a book impaired the significance of this sublime conception and thereby have opened the way to interpretations of life still more erroneous.

The perversion of the Doctrine of Election is another temporary feature in the system of Puritanism. Taken over from the Jews in its perverted form it was found to be peculiarly congenial to Puritanism in its declining stages. Rightly understood and applied 'Election' is a gracious principle—the strong helping the weak. Inequalities in races and individuals, special gifts, disadvantages, and limitations are patent facts of experience. 'Election' is a provision of Grace, an intervention of divine compassion designed to ameliorate the hardness of Nature. The Jews, though endowed with exceptional capacity for spiritual service, inverted the intention of Providence, monopolizing for themselves what was meant for mankind. The Puritans followed the bad example. Between 'the elect' and the 'non-elect' a gulf was fixed with no bridge between. The restriction of Revelation and the perversion of Election had disastrous consequences which brought down upon the Puritans the hatred which has followed them in spite of noble elements in their creed and practice.

With the increase of industrial prosperity in the nineteenth century, of which the Puritans had their due share, the perverted election-idea was further corrupted. Material prosperity was regarded as 'a peculiar mark of divine favour': poverty equally as 'a mark of divine displeasure.' The elect had secured the front seats in this world. They were assured of the front seats in the next as well! What was left for the rest? Need it be wondered that Rousseau and Karl Marx supplanted Micah and Isaiah as champions of the people?

It would be unfair to say that this caricature of Election was accepted by all Puritans. There were protesting voices, but these were drowned in the rising tide of material success.

Over against the temporary defects of Puritanism we place its permanent and essential elements of Grace and Purity. Purity is part of the new life flowing from Grace, but demands special notice because of its importance in the Puritan scheme. From their insistence on this virtue, indeed, the

Puritans received their name which like other names in history was used in derision by their opponents.

Purity meant, especially, right sexual relations. The Cavaliers repudiated their opponents' interpretation of this relationship and fastened upon them the name 'Puritan.' The conflict has continued, and the name Puritan has been extended to a view on conduct which divides the world.

It is impossible here to enter fully upon a subject so large and complicated, but some obscurities about it may be cleared away. Purity, chastity, and *cleanliness* have the same basal meaning which in plain English is freedom from filth. The cult of cleanliness (purity of the body) is well known in our time and very properly applauded. If so, why should the instinct for spiritual cleanliness (purity of the soul) be derided? There can be no reason but the strong current tending towards degeneration (back to the ape) which has caught hold of our people. The reason, certainly, is not the question of attaining Purity. That is another matter.

We marvel at the devices of Nature in attaining Purity, but they have been attained—the purity of the soil and the purity of the sea, of the rain that falls down from heaven, of the vapour drawn up from the ground. John Ruskin has taught us what a handful of mud can yield when it is purified—the dewdrop from the water, the diamond from the coal dust, the opal from the sand, the sapphire from the clay! Nature and Grace, we see, are both on the side of the Puritans, so is Science, rightly so-called, so is the æsthetic instinct and so the moral instinct of the human spirit, 'Create in me a clean heart, O God.' 'Oh, that a man would arise in me, that the man I am may cease to be.' The Puritans have here grasped something of permanent and essential value to life. They have reached a foundation that cannot easily be shaken.

There is a choice open to us whether we are religious or non-religious. We must all move on; we cannot stand still. We are divided into companies—those who choose to go down the stream, resigning themselves as mere animals to the play of Nature, and those who choose to go up the stream to realize the ideal which they believe to be properly human. Of the latter, there is again a sub-division—those who ascend the stream with divine aid, who believe in Grace, and those who believe they can ascend in their own strength: Animalists, Christians, and Humanists.

The choice of the Animalist appears to be the

line of least resistance, the easier way; but the appearance is a deception. Man is not a mere animal as these easy-going people suppose. He is an animal plus something more, and this something more is the snag in the down-going stream that has upset his boat. Obedience to Nature which brings order and contentment to animals brings disaster and misery to men.

The option of the Humanist to ascend the stream in his own strength has also turned out to be a delusion. He believed he had Nature on his side. He believed in the advance of Humanity by the unconscious process of development and the natural trend of things, the current flowing uphill as it were. Fuller knowledge has, however, dispelled this illusion. The bombing-plane, poison-gas, and the tank have appeared. Psychology, too, throws its weight against the belief in natural progress. Nature is deaf to the appeals of men. In view of more complete knowledge the remark of the French thinker, Baudouin, appears just and sane, 'How can a man believe in *himself* when he knows himself to be an atom merely in the inevitable forces of matter.'

Aristotle and St. Paul have both given us an outline of 'the gentleman' (*Ethics* and 1 Co 13, *et seq.*). The outlines agree in many points, but there is a difference that must not be overlooked. The Greek writer contents himself with description, the Christian Apostle goes further. He not only describes the good man, but he exhorts and commands his hearers to become good men. 'I beseech you *therefore*, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice.' 'Ye are the temples of the Holy Ghost,' and there is much of the same kind in every Epistle.

Such a way of speaking was unknown to the Greek. He would probably have regarded it as absurd. So also would the Jew, but for the fact that he had a decisive experience which the Greek had not, an experience of Grace through Jesus Christ. This experience turned the balance and changed the absurd and impossible into a reasonable and imperative command. The purpose of Grace was to make the command a reality—the creation of the new man. Christianity is not sermonizing merely.

This call to men to become new creatures without a corresponding external and spiritual power would have been equally to Aristotle and to St. Paul an absurdity. It would have appeared so to the Puritans also and to all men with the exception perhaps of the Humanists. But, like St. Paul, the Puritans knew that this aid independent of them-



selves was available for them. The fact of Grace was decisive in their endeavour.

Nevertheless, Puritanism through its excessive leaning towards the Old Testament is an imperfect expression of Christianity. It is a skeleton only, a skeleton requiring to be 'clothed upon' as provided for in the New Testament.

The practical shortcomings of the Puritans have already been mentioned—a sense of superiority, a tendency to judging, hypocrisy, conspicuous, and ugly faults—faults to be rejected not defended. They do not belong to the essence of Puritanism. They are blemishes, excrescences. They arise from the blending of high ideas with human infirmities. The Puritans shared the defect of Daedalus who essayed to fly before he had learned the laws of flight.

Luther opened the Bible and made it free to every reader, but the Puritans (some at least) abused this liberty. They believed that through an enlightenment peculiar to themselves they had found in the Bible a key to all knowledge, in Prophecy

an anticipation of History, in the other parts a text-book adequate for the Universe, for the whole of Science. No wonder they had a good conceit of themselves. No wonder they passed judgment unsparingly without due knowledge. No wonder they made up for their shortcomings by pretending to be what they were not.

Puritanism is a heroic creed and makes demands upon human nature, to which it reacts very slowly. The alternative is tempting: 'Swim with the tide'; but this choice, as we have seen, has its drawbacks also. Some, again, would have it that Nature supplies all we need to reach our ideal, but it is not so.

A recent Lecturer (Professor Powicke) has summed up the matter in this way. 'If a true gentleman, cultivated, just, generous, is also a Puritan, austere with himself and filled with the sense of God, he is the most civilized and free of all living things.'

This is Puritanism. But if it is to recover its influence, it must purge itself from false accretions. It must be the real thing.

## Recent Foreign Theology.

### Varia.

PROFESSOR FENDT has now completed his treatise on practical theology,<sup>1</sup> the first part of which was noticed last year (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, November, 1938). The second part includes advice on religious education and training of the young, while the third has, among other things, suggestions on visiting prisons and hospitals, besides a section on the duties of army chaplains. Every function of the ministry is handled with a rare combination of scholarship and religious insight. Like Dr. Heiler, Dr. Fendt has brought over from the Roman Church a sense of worship and vital devotion, which is invaluable in a monograph of this kind. The German students are to be envied for possessing such an introduction to the Christian ministry. Unluckily it would not be feasible to translate the work, as it is intended specially for

Germans; the literary references, as well as the particular problems, in certain cases, lie outside the English or the American field. It is much to be wished that in our language we had some such treatise. Of books on preaching we have enough, and more than enough, but there is room for a volume like this, written with the same combination of qualities, and it is to be hoped that the lead given so admirably by Dr. Fendt may be followed up before long.

Professor Hempel's short, closely argued essay<sup>2</sup> expands an idea already suggested in his books on the inner ethos of Israel. Like other nations of the ancient world, in Israel religion and politics were vitally connected, and yet the tension between them, when the religious feeling became more advanced precipitated a conflict which culminated in the death of Jesus, and which, according to the essayist, is bound up with convinced and moving religion.

<sup>1</sup> *Grundriss der Praktischen Theologie für Studenten und Kandidaten*, Zweite Abteilung, 1938, Dritte Abteilung, 1939, by Leonard Fendt, Professor der Theologie an der Universität, Berlin (J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen).

<sup>2</sup> *Politische Absicht und Politische Wirkung im Biblischen Schrifttum*, by Johannes Hempel, Professor an der Universität, Berlin (J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, Leipzig; RM.1.80).

The State is suspicious of movements which draw their vitality from sources which are non-political. The problem is clearly stated, but naturally not worked out in view of modern situations. Like all the author's work, the essay, which is an enlarged and annotated lecture, commands admiration for its learning and insight. It is issued as the first Heft for 1938 in *Der Alte Orient*, and the notes are crammed with up-to-date data on matters of text and interpretation.

The archimandrite Cassien continues in *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* (1938, pp. 327-343) the investigation to which reference was made in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for November, 1938. He now argues that Jn 20<sup>19-23</sup> and the Acts story of Pentecost refer to the appearance of Jesus 'in the Spirit,' carrying both baptism and the remission of sins as gifts for the interval before the return of the Lord. He considers, with some other scholars, that not only is Jn 14<sup>20</sup> eschatological but that *aeon* in Jn 14<sup>16</sup> has a temporal sense, like the closing phrase of Mt 28<sup>18-20</sup> (ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος); the Spirit-revelation is for the period between the Ascension and the return of the Lord. Much attention is paid to theological implications in Greek theology, but the continuation of the exegetical argument is promised, at any rate in book form.

From a different angle the eschatology of the primitive Church is discussed in a fresh monograph by Friedrich Busch,<sup>1</sup> which forms part of the *Neutestamentlichen Forschungen*, edited by Professor Otto Schmitz. The author, after surveying work, mainly recent and German, on the subject finds comfort neither in the speculations of Form-criticism nor in the discovery of a 'small Apocalypse.' Particular attention is paid to the religious tradition underlying the entire chapter, which is claimed to be most significant as an expression of the primitive kerugma; this tradition goes back to the Old Testament and later Judaism rather than to outside influences, as the author argues in the fourth section of the book (pp. 63-119). Thus 'the Original Man (*Urmensch*) concept outside the Bible teaches that redemption comes from humanity; the Biblical concept teaches that it cannot come from humanity' (p. 102), as the coming of the Son of Man is the action of God Himself. Busch agrees with Jeremias that the one clue to the

consciousness of His high calling, from the opening of His mission to the Cross, is to be found in Jesus' relation to the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53 (p. 89 f.), and one service of his exegesis is to bring out the primary significance of the Old Testament for the kerugma of the whole chapter. In verse 6, for example, the claim of rivals, 'I am he' (ἐγώ εἰμι), is the continuation of the pagan claim (Is 47<sup>8</sup>, see Zeph 2<sup>15</sup>) to oppose the Lord's sole authority. In short, the chapter represents a new Christian phase of elements in the Old Testament and apocalyptic tradition, due to the commanding personality of Jesus; He alone can say truly, 'I am he,' as He brings or embodies the divine kingdom, and—Busch stresses this point—as He anticipates suffering (θλῖψις), since the confession of His name ('Christ') involves always trouble for those who maintain this against semi-Christian or anti-Christian assertions, during the painful period 'till all this comes to pass' (verse 30), for this saying does not refer to the second advent directly.

The value of the treatise lies in its stress on the religious tradition behind the chapter. Though some points are unduly pressed, Busch has done good service in his criticism of Bultmann, Klostermann, and others. The suspicion of any literary account of the chapter may also be questioned as overdone. Nevertheless the central argument is timely, as a protest against the tendency to seek sources for the primitive kerugma of the Church outside the Old Testament.

Dr. Adler's learned, comprehensive monograph<sup>2</sup> agrees that the speech in strange tongues at Pentecost was a distinct, unique event, and that it is not the same as the 'speaking with tongues' phenomenon at Corinth and elsewhere, but he rules out any attempt to explain the story as a fresh, imaginative adaptation of ideas already familiar in Judaism or elsewhere. He does not seem to realize how, at Delos, for example, revelations of the divinely inspired will were polyglot, and that Apollo gave pilgrims answers in their respective dialects, as the Homeric hymns prove. Philo's evidence that a similar tradition had grown up round the giving of the Law does not indeed contain the later touches of rabbinic tradition, but it serves to indicate a similar notion in Judaism, out of which, together with the Greek idea already mentioned, an early Christian tradition about some outburst

<sup>1</sup> *Zum Verständnis der synoptischen Eschatologie: Markus 13 neu untersucht* (C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; M. 5).

<sup>2</sup> *Das erste christliche Pfingstfest. Sinn und Bedeutung des Pfingstberichtes* App. 2. 1-13, von Nikolaus Adler (Aschendorfsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster in Westf.; RM. 6.75).



of inspiration at the start of the Christian movement may well have been shaped. The usefulness of the monograph lies in the collection of data upon almost every point of the story, in the wide survey of ecclesiastical and critical opinion, and in the caution shown in accepting current theories, rather than in the restatement of an old interpretation.

In a paper (*Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*, 1938, pp. 287-295) M. Charles Masson agrees that in the story of the leper's healing (Mk 1<sup>40-45</sup>) internal probability is in favour of ὀργισθεῖς, for which σπλαγχνισθεῖς was substituted, but he offers an ingenious explanation of the sense. Why was Jesus 'irritated' or 'indignant'? Dismissing the usual explanations, he attributes this *le plus vif mécontentement* of Jesus to a feeling of resentment at having this demand for healing thrust upon Him by a leper who had desperately made his way into the house, thereby creating what was an illegal situation, which Jesus had no wish to create. M. Masson thinks that there were no witnesses to the meeting, and that the leper had seized the chance of bursting into some house where Jesus was. This fits in with the context, as another proof that Jesus at this period did not seek out controversial issues but had them forced upon Him. Hence His order to the man, sternly uttered, to obey the due regulations of the Law. M. Masson sums up by noting that the story thus recalls the situation of the ministry of the Lord. 'He was not afraid of being rendered impure by the touch of the leper. The motive of His anger was not personal. He touched the untouchable and thereby proved in striking fashion how He was not taken up with any consequences to Himself. But He was annoyed at the situation created by the desperate move of the leper, who created a situation contrary to the Mosaic Law under which God had placed His people.' It was not yet time to break with that Law. Hence ὀργισθεῖς.

In *Theologische Quartalschrift* (1938, pp. 427-469) Dr. B. Hennen studies 1 Co 12 and Ro 12<sup>3-8</sup> under the title of 'Ordines Sacri.' By 'the word of wisdom' the order of apostles is denoted, 'the word of knowledge' refers to teachers or presbyters (priests), and the diaconate follows under ἐνεργήματα, διακονία, δύναμις. One of the author's contentions is that the Jewish basis of the primitive ministry is all-important, and that this comes out more clearly in Romans than in 1 Corinthians. But it is not very clear how to find a 'secretary' in πίστις as well as ἀντίληψις, still less the order

of readers, translating the lessons as they read them, in γένη γλωσσῶν etc., or a singer in ὁ ἐλεῶν. The hint that Jewish precedents should be studied for the Christian origins of the ministry is valuable, and has been worked out by other scholars. The special exegesis, which endeavours to find in these two passages anticipations of the Roman Church's later orders is much less convincing, though clever. Dr. Hennen admits at the end that non-ordained Christians are by no means excluded from this mystical fellowship of church-officials. Yet it is hard to see, on his interpretation, where they come in, if the primary reference of the apostle is supposed to have been to definite orders of ministry.

JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

A VOLUME of studies by the friends and pupils of the veteran astronomer and chronologer, Professor Edward Mahler, published in honour of his eightieth birthday, has been published in Budapest.<sup>1</sup> It is a polyglot volume, containing thirteen contributions in Hungarian, thirteen in German, six in English, two in French, two in Italian, and two in Hebrew. The Hungarian articles, whose titles are all given in English as well as in Hungarian, are likely to be closed books to most readers in this country, but the others contain not a few things of real interest to Biblical scholars.

Professors Aisleitner and Cassuto write on the Ras Shamra texts. The former writes in German on the Dan'el text, which he regards rather as an 'Aḳhat myth, equating Dan'el, the father of 'Aḳhat, not with a legendary human king of Tyre, but with Mot of the Ba'al myth. He supplies a translation of the text, differing not a little from Virolleaud's rendering, and also notes. Cassuto writes in Italian on a passage in the Ras Shamra text known as I AB, maintaining that lines 1-26 of this text, containing Mot's message to Ba'al, should be understood as a challenge from a rival aspirant to power, and not as an amicable communication.

In the field of Assyriology are two contributions in French, from A. David and D. Sidersky. The former deals with the theory that Sumerian and Chinese are related in their origin, and critically examines Ungnad's view. He notes three examples

<sup>1</sup> *Dissertationes in Honorem Dr. Eduardi Mahler*, edited by A. Wertheimer, J. de Somogyi and S. Löwinger (Published by the Edward Mahler Jubilee Committee: Chairman, A. Wertheimer, Ferenc József Rabbinical Seminary).

where form of writing, pronunciation, and meaning appear to be related in the two languages—a meagre basis on which to build a far-reaching theory. Sidersky deals with the chronology of the first Babylonian dynasty, and defends the views advanced by the late Professor Langdon and Dr. Fotheringham.

There are three contributions in German in the field of Egyptology, from A. Dobrovits, J. Pálfi, and W. Wessetzky. Of these the first deals with Egyptian statuary, the third with scarabs, and the other with offerings to the dead in ancient Egypt. A single article deals with Hittite questions. This is G. Furlani's article in Italian on the confession of sins amongst the Hittites. There are nine non-Hungarian articles on rabbinical subjects.

One of the editors, Dr. Joseph de Somogyi, writes in English on 'Biblical Figures in ad-Damiri's Hayat al-hayawan,' from which post-classical Arabic work he culls legends about Adam, Enoch, Cain, Noah, Gomer, Nimrod, Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Korah, Balaam, David, Solomon, Jonah, Gog and Magog, Jeremiah, Daniel, Jesus, and St. Paul. The legends have, of course, no critical value, but are valuable for the discussion of the extent of Jewish influence on early Islam.

L. Éder-Szászy provides a brief introduction and translation from Arabic into English of 'A hitherto unpublished Martyr Act of St. Victor of Alexandria.'

The remaining articles lie farther off the track of the Biblical scholar. It is a pity that three articles on the life and work of Dr. Mahler are all in Hungarian. Happily a large proportion of his work has appeared in German and English. The list of his publications runs to two hundred and seventy-five titles, including books, articles, and signed reviews.

H. H. ROWLEY.

Bangor.

THAT brilliant and independent Dutch scholar, Dr. B. D. Eerdmans, has retired from the Chair he so long occupied in the University of Leiden, but his interest in his subject is as keen as ever. He has now entered on a series of studies in the Book of Job, of which two have appeared together, dealing with the Conception of God in the Book of Job and with Leviathan.<sup>1</sup> In the former of these he discusses the names El, Eloah, and Shaddai, especially in relation to the Jahu of the Prologue and Epilogue

to the book. He comes to the conclusion, based on the attitude of Job and Elihu towards the three, that these are intended to be separate deities, and that, contrary to the usual view, the poem is therefore far older than the prose framework. In discussing Leviathan, Professor Eerdmans points out that the description of this creature is confined to Job 40<sup>25-33</sup>, the passages before and after this dealing with the hippopotamus. From the relevant verses he comes to the conclusion that Leviathan here is certainly not the crocodile; it may be the porpoise or the tunny. There are mythological elements which may be taken into account, but these do not affect the original identification of the creature. Needless to say, the case is admirably put and skilfully argued, and we cannot but feel grateful to Dr. Eerdmans for his study of two very interesting questions.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

## French Protestantism.

THE Protestants form a very small minority in France, but their influence, intellectual and social, is greater than might be expected from these numbers, for their thought and action is vital and vigorous. Two examples may be here offered. (1) The journal *Le Christianisme Social* for February-March (a double number) gives a full record of the Christian Social Congress at Montpellier on 11th to 13th November, 1938, at which the jubilee of *The Protestant Association for Social Study and Action* was celebrated. In the first part an interesting and inspiring commemoration of the pioneers of the movement is given, and a historical survey of the fifty years' progress. The second part deals with three crucial problems of to-day, in which there is acute division of opinion, the economic, the political, and the international. A business man (M. René Duchemin) defends the capitalist system and meets with a retort from a professor (George Lasserre), who considers the proposed collaboration of classes impossible under capitalism. The German Professor, F. Wilhelm Foerster, a true patriot, but an exile from his native land because of his opposition to the present régime, gives a damning indictment of National Socialism in principle and in practice, and calls to uncompromising resistance. Of special interest in this contribution, which is probably the most important, is the account of the historic background. The actual situation in Germany was only the occasion for the emergence of Hitlerism; in its older tendencies—Pangermanism

<sup>1</sup> *Studies in Job*: (1) *The Conception of God in the Book of Job* (2) *Liwjatan (Leviathan)* (Burgersdijk and Niedermans, Leiden).



and Prussianism—find an expression. The famous Russian author, Berdiaeff, discusses the danger for Christianity in materialistic communism. A survey of the international situation by Professor Theodore Ruysen is given to show the conditions which must be recognised in actions for peace. The discussion showed how divergent in France is the estimate of the Munich agreement. Common to all the addresses and discussions is the sustaining and inspiring conviction of all the speakers that it is only the grace of Christ as declared in the gospel that can afford the constraining motive in seeking the solution of the problems, and that in the Kingdom of God must be seen the goal of human history. This issue of the journal has much more than an ephemeral value, and is warmly commended. Neither in theory nor in practice can French Protestantism without loss be ignored.

(2) The Theological Faculty of the University of Strasbourg through its journal *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses*<sup>1</sup> often makes valuable contributions to theology, to some of which I have called attention. One of the most valuable has been made by F. Ménégos in this 'extrait'—*Trinité, à propos d'un article de M. Henri L. Miéville, 1939*. On his discussion of the article which is the occasion of his writing it is not necessary to enter into details, except to make the general statement that while he agrees with M. Miéville in emphasizing the contrast between the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and the teaching of the New Testament as a diversion under the influence of Hellenistic thought rather than a development, he makes his own standard of judgment of what does belong to divine revelation, and what is human reflexion. 'One knows to-day that for all primitive Christianity there was the revealing act of the omnipotence of God in and by the Resurrection, that is to say, the devotion and the glorification of Jesus Crucified' (p. 471). God reveals Himself in exercising His saving power in the Resurrection of Christ, and in imparting as an accompaniment of the Resurrection the Holy Spirit. By His grace men are through faith brought not only into communion with God, but even into participation in the life of God.

<sup>1</sup> Librairie Félix Alcan, Paris.

The author argues that the New Testament subordinates the Son to the Father and the Spirit to the Son as well as the Father; and that the Spirit is not conceived as so distinctively personal as is God and Christ. It is an *economic* and not an *ontological* trinity that he finds in the New Testament; and he relegates all attempts to explain the uniqueness of Christ to a subordinate position as not belonging to revelation; he mentions six explanations: the Davidic descent of Jesus; His normal birth by an act of the creative Spirit; His virginal and miraculous birth in virtue of a conception by the Holy Spirit; the descent on Jesus of the Spirit at the moment of His baptism; the advent of the Heavenly Man, the second Adam taking the place of the first Adam, drawn from the earth; the incarnation of the pre-existent Logos in the rabbi of Nazareth. His critical attitude is more negative than mine would be. I cannot, as he does, oppose the doctrine of the Resurrection to the doctrine of the Incarnation, although I regard the Hellenistic doctrine of the Logos as a misleading influence on later Christology. He admits a religious, but not metaphysical, doctrine of Incarnation, since the glory of the Risen Lord casts its radiance backward on the earthly life. I hold, however, that the Resurrection must not be so isolated. It is the consummation of the progressive Incarnation; and I can accept the Johannine as well as the Pauline Christology. He deprecates any metaphysical speculation, and would confine Christian doctrine to the New Testament teaching, in so far as it belongs to revelation. I cannot in my own thinking accept that limitation. I agree with him that the orthodox dogma does not adequately identify the action of God the Creator with His action in Christ as Redeemer, that it imperils monotheism in a tendency to tritheism and that it does not safeguard the real humanity of Christ. In his concluding paragraphs he pleads for a revised theology drawn from the New Testament alone as the only possible basis of the reunion of the churches; and that conviction I share. I commend this contribution to our urgently necessary theological rethinking as one deserving, and rewarding appreciative study. A. E. GARVIE.

London.



## Entre Nous.

### What We Believe.

I found myself lately on a visit to a house where nine books stood in the spare room. The first one I took up was the autobiography of Augustine Birrell—*Things Beyond Redress*—in which I came across a chapter explaining how it was that the very sensitive writer, who had so much profited by intercourse with good folk and true, nevertheless could not bring himself to believe in the hope of immortality. The next book was the late E. V. Lucas's life-story. Here, to my surprise I found the genial author confessing to no sort of belief in religion. He wrote that he could never at any time feel drawn to the Faith, and added that for this reason—because one side of life seemed to him so miserable—he had tried to write of pleasant things.

These two books made me curious as to what sort of outlook I should find in the remaining volumes. From F. L. Lucas's *Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal*, which stood next to E. V. L., there was this sentence—'It is the dead that must help us to keep life living, the grace of Mozart and Ronsard . . . the courage of Hardy.'

But there was more, much more in my next book, the life of that fine young doctor John Melly of Ethiopia. There I came on a declaration of faith—one reads it wistfully, when one remembers how he died so young, in the Abyssinian conflict—'All things work together for good to them who love the Lord—that's not a banality, but an eternal truth. What's left of this life is at most an unimportant prelude—and there's all Eternity!'

Next, I read *A Wanderer's Way*, by Canon Raven. It is full of Christian confidence. 'To believe not merely that human society might be recast nearer to the heart's desire, but that God's eternal purpose, revealed in the whole process of evolution and supremely in Christ Jesus, is coming to its fulfilment, is to find at once an infinite scope for service and an infinite inspiration to serve. . . . We have only to lift up our eyes and we shall see here and now the King in His glory.'

It took me a considerable time to go through the vivacious recollections of the novelist, W. B. Maxwell. At the very end he speaks of his faith in the power of Kindness. 'In youth and age,' he writes, 'I have been given the same lesson from life. It all seems to fit together convincingly. If I had to say it with absolute plainness, I could but repeat it in increased strength, and say thus:

"Kindness. Be kind to people. And then, when you have been as kind as you possibly can, be a little kinder still."

The last three books on the shelf were all, as it happened, by brilliant literary people who had been ill constantly. They were all highly unconventional. Was any testimony of faith, I wondered, to be found in the *Letters of Anne Douglas Sedgwick*, she whose delicately etched stories were once so delighted in by many of us? She had a hard time of it, getting, we gather, slowly more and more helpless. 'You know,' she wrote from her sick-bed to a friend, 'though I can't accept orthodox religion, I think it symbolizes truths; for instance, that the Spirit, in which we all live and move and have our being, must be—thought—feeling—will—therefore a Trinity. And this Spirit incarnates itself in the world. Other dogmas of the Church seem to me to have great truth—if one divests them of their narrower interpretations and looks upon them as truths, and not facts.'

In Tchekhov's *Letters*, his confession of faith is strictly of this world; he wrote it when trying to fight consumption in Yalta in the Crimea, this man whose plays to-day command so attentive an audience—'I don't believe in our educated class, which is hypocritical, false, hysterical, badly educated, and indolent. I don't believe in it, even when it's suffering and complaining, for its oppressors come from its own entrails. I believe in individual people. I see salvation in individual personalities scattered here and there all over Russia—educated people or peasants—they have strength; though they are few.'

There remained Kathleen Mansfield's *Journal*. Her brilliant short stories are not forgotten, especially the set published under the title, *The Garden Party*. She, too, was a great invalid.

'I should like this to be accepted as my confession,' she wrote in her Diary in 1920, ' . . . I do not want to die without leaving a record of my belief that suffering can be overcome. For I do believe it. One must submit. Do not resist. Take it. Be overwhelmed. Accept it fully. Make it part of life. Everything in life that we really accept undergoes a change. So suffering must become Love. This is the mystery. This is what I must do. I must pass from personal love to greater love. . . . Sorrow shall be changed into joy. It is to lose oneself more utterly, to love more deeply, to feel oneself part of life—not separate. . . .



Oh Life, accept me, make me worthy . . . teach me.'

Orthodox, and unorthodox, all the writers of these nine books, placed by chance on a shelf together, stated their attitude to religion and life.

CONSTANCE MILES.

T. S. Eliot.

It is doubtful if Mr. T. S. Eliot's new play, *The Family Reunion* (Faber & Faber; 7s. 6d. net), will ever have a tearing success upon the stage, but if there is to be a real movement towards the development of poetic speech in popular drama, this play will at least have important experimental value. The form, a kind of elastic iambic blank verse, goes into harness with the mood of the speaker, at times it may be a succinct, elegant prose, modern to the bone, at times poetry. Perhaps the passages with most charm and freshness of all lie in between those two regions:

The spring is very late in this northern country,  
Late and uncertain, clings to the south wall.  
The gardener has no garden flowers to give me  
for this evening.

I had rather wait for our wind-blown blossoms,  
Such as they are, than have those greenhouse  
flowers

Which do not belong here, which do not know  
The wind and the rain, as I know them.

If Tchekhov had been an Englishman he might have written like that.

But we are preachers and theologians, and here are burning pages we should not neglect. They will be freely read by those who are our readers. The drama is one of the inner life, and it is so real a reflection of a life lived in a tangle of different values that at first sight we are apt to call the play itself a tangle. The setting is elegant, but there is a distortion of form, as if one listened to strings playing on different keys. So we suffer because we are reading a tract which smites upon our conscience; there is the same dissonance in our own life, hide it as we may.

Here, in one drawing-room assembled, are those who pretend they do not see, or do not suspect, their own spiritual destiny, and those others who dare to brood, with staring eyes, upon their tragic fate, upon the tragic fate, stained with sin and retribution, which is the portion of mankind.

And it is in the *present*, that only eternal life which is the agony and ecstasy of the knowledge of God, it is in that present moment alone that sin and

retribution and forgiveness meet. But in Mr. Eliot's play only the two bitterest sufferers—Harry, who returns for a few hours to the home and people of his childhood; and Agatha, who had loved Harry's father and should have been his mother—are aware of this.

Everything tends towards reconciliation

As the stone falls, as the tree falls. And in the  
end

That is the completion which at the beginning  
Would have seemed the ruin . . .

What we have written is not a story of detection  
Of crime and punishment, but of sin and expiation.  
It is possible you have not known what sin  
You shall expiate, or whose, or why. It is certain  
That the knowledge of it must precede the  
expiation.

It is possible that sin may strain and struggle  
In its dark instinctive birth, to come to con-  
sciousness,  
And so find expurgation. . . .

When Harry believes this, a sense of peace comes to him—

I feel happy, for a moment, as if I had come  
home.

One may regret that Mr. Eliot introduces the *Eumenides* at this point. Possibly he did so from a theological impulse. One suspects that he wished to show that the fundamental truth behind the Greek conception and the Christian is identical. That may be true, but the inevitable artistic disturbance which we have already suffered, though with acceptance and understanding, was about as much as we could bear. The strain becomes almost too great. A certain simplicity which all great drama demands is forfeited. And this anachronism in so essentially modern a work might so naturally have been avoided, and the moral effect heightened, by the use of that Christian symbolism which would have been nearer to Mr. Eliot's own outlook. For, even if the world is rapidly donning the garments of neo-paganism, the mass of playgoers and play-readers are still more amenable to Christian images than to Greek. And though there may be interest for the theologian in finding likenesses between Greek and Christian thought, Mr. Eliot knows that for this tragic situation Greece alone cannot suffice. More than that, the form and matter of the play is far more Christian than Greek.

Where does one go from a world of insanity?  
Somewhere on the other side of despair.



To the worship in the desert, the thirst and deprivation,

A stony sanctuary and a primitive altar,

The heat of the sun and the icy vigil,

A care over lives of humble people,

The lesson of ignorance, of incurable diseases,

Such things are possible. It is love and terror

Of what waits and wants me, and will not let me fall.

EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON.

### Life Has Taught Me.

Writing in the *Forward Movement* of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America, Sir Wilfred Grenfell of Labrador says: 'Life has taught me to love her with all the zest of a game in which I am permitted to play. To-day, at well over seventy years, I am just as keen for life as ever I was. I have always believed that life is eternal, for my conscious spirit so ardently hoped it, and such a universal, instinctive desire in normal life cannot be doomed to disappointment. 'When his friends asked Socrates, about to drink the lethal draught, where they should bury him, he replied: "Anywhere you like if you can catch me." In the words of the late Sir William Osler, "I would rather be wrong with Socrates than right with Plato."

'Life has taught me to regard my body purely as a link between my spirit and the material world. It warns me continually not to damage my carcass by either swallowing or breathing in toxins, or by letting any of my physical assets atrophy through lack of care or exercise.

'Life has taught me that one reason my pennies were given me is to guard the welfare of my bodily machine; but that if we look to that machine for final satisfaction we are bitterly undeceived. When control passes from "me" to my body, from the spiritual to the material, shipwreck is inevitable. On the other hand, life teaches me that to those led by honour, love and unselfishness is given the laurel wreath.

'Life has taught me that I can be of worth to God. One of the many irrefutable evidences of the Divine nature of Christ to me has always been His insistence that the light of life can only be obtained by experience. He never set an examination paper that we must answer correctly. His was a challenge to action. He wanted not wise men to understand Him but brave men to follow Him.

'Life has taught me the menace of any man's claims to infallibility. The claim to infallibility is as stultifying to progress as it is dangerous. The most encouraging aspect of science of to-day is its

growing modesty. The wisdom of to-day is the folly of to-morrow. If I were to practise medicine as I was taught it in the sacred Lecture Halls of London and Oxford, I would land in the penitentiary.

'Life has taught me unfailing optimism in spite of our poor presentation of Christianity. We of the twentieth century are no longer cave men. If righteousness, joy and peace are prizes to be won, education is not meant to fill buckets with facts but to light candles for the darkness of the world. The hope of bringing the Kingdom of God to earth does not depend on politics or law or force, but on the conquest of ourselves. The true *joie de vivre* is not in getting, but in giving, not in indulgence but in control. There was only one class which Christ condemned to the "place prepared for the devil"—the unprofitable, those indifferent folk who did nothing.

'I have heard it said that the world is divided into two classes: those who try to do things for others and those who spend their time criticising them because they do not work in some other way. The perfecting of this world is our human problem, and in that lies our dignity in life, our joy and our justification.'

### The Bible and the Koran.

'The Koran itself bears clear testimony to the Bible. Other sacred books have no reference to the Gospel or to Jesus Christ. But Mohammed could not escape Him. This is one of the most remarkable facts in the study of the non-Christian religions. Sir William Muir has collated all of these references [to the Bible] and commented on their character and significance. There are 131 passages altogether, 65 of the Mecca period, and 66 of the Medina period in the Prophet's life. The Old and New Testament are highly spoken of as God's earlier revelation and as "containing light and guidance for the pious."

'On the cover of an Albanian translation of the Koran there is a reproduction of an old German picture of Christ and the two disciples on their way to Emmaus. But the title reads: "Mohammed, Abu Bakr and Ali on Their Way to Mecca"! So even Christian art is being adopted by Moslems!'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> S. M. Zwemer, *Dynamic Christianity and the World To-day*, 158.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.